CHHATRAPATI SAMBHAJI (1657-1689 A.D.)

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree

of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN ARTS

(HISTORY)

of the

UNIVERSITY OF BOMBAY

UNIVERSITY OF BOMBAY
23 JUL 1976
LIBRARY.

5457

By

Pandit Shankar Joshi, M.A.,

Under the Guidance of

Dr. C.M. Kulkarni

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

UNIVERSITY OF BOMBAY

10 May, 1976.

5457

Statement to be submitted under Ordinance 770 and 771 relating to the Ph.D. Degree of the University of Bombay.

The results of the research include discovery of new facts and also new relations of facts observed by others. The work tends to the general advancement of knowledge so far as it throws new light on certain problems of Maratha history and their administrative system. Further, the comparative study attempted in this thesis is bound to be of considerable interest to all students of history and polity. The sources of information include various original manuscripts, letters, treatises etc., some of which have been included in the bibliography at the end of the thesis.

I further state that I have not been awarded a Degree or Diploma or any other academic award of this University or any other University or body for the thesis I am submitting nor does the thesis incorporate any work on any thesis covering a wider field ever submitted by me for a degree or Diploma or other academic award in this or any other University or body. It is my own contribution and not a joint work with any other person.

C.M. Kulkarni

(C.M. Kulkarni)
Guiding Teacher

P.S. Joshi

(P.S. Joshi)

PREFACE

The purpose of this thesis is to attempt a critical study of the life and reign of Chhatrapati Sambhaji (1657-1689 A.D.).

I am happy to express my deep sense of gratitude to Dr. C.M. Kulkarni, Department of History of the University of Bombay, for the encouragement and valuable guidance he has given to me in the work of this thesis.

I also express my sense of gratitude to Shri. Setu Madhavrao Pagadi, with whom I had an opportunity to discuss many matters related to Chhatrapati Sambhaji and whose valuable suggestions have helped me greatly in my work.

Dr. B.K. Apte, Professor of History, Post-graduate Research Centre of the University of Bombay, Goa; Dr.P.M. Joshi, former Director of Archives, Maharashtra State; Prof. N.R. Phatak, Director, Itihas Samshodhan Mandal, Dadar; Prof. G.H. Khare of the Bharat Itihas Samshodhan Mandal, Poona; Prof. R.V. Oturkar, Poona; Shri. V.G. Khobrekar, Director of Archives, Maharashtra State; Dr. A.R. Kulkarni, Professor of History, University of Poona; Shri. S.R. Tikekar, and Father Anthony D'Costa of the St. Xavier's College, Bombay, evinced keen and continuous interest in the progress of my work and helped me in solving many difficulties. I, therefore, thank them very much.

I also thank Dr. Anderson, Shri. Tikekar, and the staff of the Library of the University of Bombay; Shri. Kandolgaonkar

of the Library of the Itihas Samshodhan Mandal, Dadar, the Librarian and the staff of the library of Kirti College, Dadar, for the library facilities they had given me.

P. S. Joshi

(P.S. Joshi)

ABBREVIATIONS

(Wherever used)

Apratima Vira Charitam - Shiva Charitra Vritta Samgraha, (Khanda I - Kanadi Vibhag, Pp.30-36)

Arthashastra - Kautilya's Arthashastra, Ed., Shamasastry, R.

BIAS - Bharatiya Itihas Ani Sanskriti, Bombay.

BISMQ - Bharat Itihas Samshodhak Mandal Quarterly, Poona.

Bakre Danapatra of Sambhaji - Shri Chhatrapati Sambhaji Maharajanche Danapatra, (Gokhale, K., Shivaputra Sambhaji, Pp.432-434).

Chikkadeva binnapam - Shiva Charitra Vritta Samgraha, (Khanda I - Kanadi Vibhag, Pp.28-30).

Dingal Letters - Sarkar, J., House of Shivaji, (Pp.151-181).

Grant Duff-HM-I - Grant Duff, J., History of the Marathas, Vol.I.

Jedhe Shakavali - Shiva Charitra Pradip, (Ed.), Apte,D.V. and Divekar, S.M., (Pp.14-39).

Jedhe Karina - Shiva Charitra Pradip, (Ed.), Apte,D.V., and Divekar, S.M.(Pp.39-48).

Keladiya Nripa Vijayam - Shiva Charitra Vritta Samgraha, (Khanda I - Kanadi Vibhag, Pp.40-74).

La Mission Du Madure III - Aiyar, R. Sathyanatha, History of the Nayaks of Madura (Pp.263-292).

Paramanandakavya - Paramanandakavya of Kavindra Paramananda,(Ed.), Sardesai, G.S.

PIHRC - Proceedings of the Indian Historical Records Commission.

Pro.AIMHC - Proceedings of the All India Modern History Congress.

QRHS - Quarterly Review of Historical Studies, Calcutta.

Rajwade Khanda - Marathyanchya Itihasachi Sadhane,(Ed.),Rajwade, V.K.

Sambhaji Shakavali - Sambhaji Kalin Patra Sar Samgraha,(BISMQ XXX, Nos.1-2, Pp.99-120).

Sanads and Letters - Selections from the Government Records in the Alienation Office Poona - Sanads and Letters, (Ed.), Vad, G.C., Mawjee, P.V., and Parasnis, D.B.

Sardesai-NHM - New History of the Marathas, Sardesai, G.S.

SCS Khanda - Shiva Charitra Sahitya Khanda.

Sen-ERS - English Records on Shivaji, (Ed.), Sen, S.N.

Sen-FBS - Foreign Biographies of Shivaji, (Ed.), Sen, S.N.

Shri Dasabodha - Shri Samartha Ramdas Swami Krita Shri Dasabodha.

Shivadigvijaya Bakhar - Shri Shiva Digvijaya (Shri Shivaji Maharajanchi Bakhar), (Ed.), Nandurbarkar, P.R., and Dandekar, L.K.

Shivaji (H) - Maharashtra - Jatiya Jivan - Surya - Hindi, Sarkar, J.

Shivapur Daftaratil Yadi - Shiva Charitra Pradip, (Ed.), Apte, D.V., and Divekar, S.M., (Pp.50-53).

Shivapur Deshpande Vahitil Shakavali - Shiva Charitra Pradip, (Ed.), Apte, D.V., and Divekar, S.M., (Pp.53-65).

Shivakalin Shakavali - Shivakalin Patrasar Samgraha III, Pp.162-208.

SPSS - Shivakalin Patra Sar Samgraha.

Storia Do Mogor - Manucci Niccolao, Storia do Mogor, (Ed.), Irvine, W.

TKK - Tarabai Kalin Kagad Patre, (Ed.), Pawar, A.G.

Watan-Patras, Nivad-Patras - Decisions from the Shahu and Peshwa Daftar containing (Watan-Patras, Nivad-Patras, etc.), (Ed.), Vad, G.C., Mawjee, P.V., and Parasnis, D.B.

CONTENTS

	PREFACE	i-ii
	ABBREVIATIONS	i-ii
I	INTRODUCTION	1-3
II	THE SOURCES	4-72
III	EARLY LIFE OF SAMBHAJI	73-127
IV	SAMBHAJI'S DESERTION TO THE MUGHALS	128-185
V	SAMBHAJI'S TRIUMPH OVER THE OPPONENTS	186-256
VI	WAR WITH THE MUGHALS (1680 - September, 1683 A.D.)	257-351
VII	SAMBHAJI'S WAR WITH THE MUGHALS (September, 1683 to 21st September, 1687)	352-421
VIII	SAMBHAJI'S WAR WITH THE MUGHALS (22nd September, 1687 to 11th March, 1689)	422-450
IX	ADMINISTRATION OF CHHATRAPATI SAMBHAJI (1680 - 1689 A.D.)	451-515
	APPENDIX - A	i-iii
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	i-xi

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Chhatrapati Shivaji expired on 3rd April, 1680.

At that time Shivaji's kingdom comprised two divisions: the area lying between Godavari and Tungabhadra rivers, and secondly the region between Tungabhadra and Kaveri rivers.[1] The first division, known as the Svarajya, had in it the areas from Maharashtra. It extended from the fort of Salher beyond the northern bank of the Godavari over the whole country of Talghat and Varghat to the Tungabhadra. The latter division extended beyond the Tungabhadra to the banks of the Kaveri and included Kolhar, Balapur, Jinji and Vellore.[2]

When a line is drawn in the map of India from the north to the south in order to mark the boundary of the Svarajya of Shivaji, it is seen that the western border of the Svarajya included Salher, Hanavantgad, Javalagad, Dindori, Ramsej, Songad, Pratapgad, Dehu, Alandi, Poona, Indapur, Sangli, Pavitragad, etc.

The Svarajya of Chhatrapati Shivaji in Maharashtra was divided into three provinces. Those were as follows :-

(I) The Northern Division - Its area was between Salher (Nasik District) and Poona and a part of Konkan, upto hundred miles roughly north of Bombay namely, Kalyan, Bhivandi, Javhar, etc.

(II) The Southern Division - Talghat (country below the ghats) Konkan South of Bombay upto Bhatkal including Dabhol,

---

1. Sabhasad - Shivaji Bakhar, p.106; Kulkarni, A.R., Maharashtra in the Age of Shivaji, p.3.
2. Sabhasad - Ibid., p.74.

Rajapur, Banda, Phonda, Karwar, Gokarna, etc.

(III) The Southern Division - Varghat or Desh (country above the ghats) from the South of Poona to Kopbal near Tungabhadra. It included the Southern Desh districts roughly from Poona to Dharwad and Kopbal[3].

As Shivaji was in constant warfare with the Mughals and the Sultan of Bijapur, this territory was not always under his complete control. Though its border areas at times changed hands, by and large the above stated territory was under Shivaji at the time of his death.

According to Krishnaji Anant Sabhasad[4], the Svarajya of Shivaji yielded a revenue of one crore of Hons, which, taking into account the exchange value of Hon varying between three to four rupees during the time of Shivaji, was in equivalence to three to four crores of rupees[5]. In addition to this regular income, the collection of the Chauth added an amount of eighty lakhs of Hons to the treasury of the Svarajya[6].

After the death of Shivaji, his eldest son, Sambhaji, became the master of the Svarajya.

Chhatrapati Shivaji was at war with the Mughals at the time of his death.

---

3. Ibid.; Kulkarni A.R., Maharashtra in the Age of Shivaji, Pp3-4.
4. Shivaji Bakhar, p.107.
5. Kulkarni A.R., Maharashtra in the Age of Shivaji, p.134.
6. ₹l Kalami Bakhar-Wakaskar, Kalam -75 Pp.32-33.

Shambhaji continued that war during 1680-1689 A.D. with varying fortunes. Finally, in that war, he was captured alive by the Mughals, and Aurangzeb put him to a cruel death.

The history of that Prince of tragic fate is unfolded in the following pages.

Chapter II

THE SOURCES

A critical survey of all the available sources, contemporary and later, and in different languages is attempted in this chapter. Further, we discuss more fully the credibility of some of the important sources which give valuable facts for the scientific history of Chhatrapati Sambhaji.

(I) CONTEMPORARY SOURCES.

(A) Dingal or Rajasthani Variety of Hindi

(1) Dingal Letters of Shivaji's Visit to Aurangzeb and After

The letters written in the Dingal dialect or the Rajasthani variety of Hindi are written by the officers of Kumar Ramsingh, who was the son and representative of Mirza Raja Jaisingh and Shivaji's care taker in the court of Aurangzeb at Agra when Shivaji visited that court in 1666. These letters were sent by the officers of Kumar Ramsingh to the Jaipur capital (Amber) for the detailed understanding of Kalyandas, the Diwan of Amber and others about the events which took place at Agra, especially between Shivaji and Ramsingh , and between Shivaji and Aurangzeb.

These Dingal letters are unique in value as they have faithfully reported these matters as soon as they took place to the courtiers of Amber.[1]

From these letters we get the most reliable and valuable information about Sambhaji's proximity with Shivaji during

---

1. Sarkar, J., Dingal Letters, p. 151.

the time when in his court at Agra, Emperor Aurangzeb ill-treated Shivaji and, then kept him under detention. We also get information from those letters about the visits of Sambhaji to the court of Aurangzeb and the opportunity which Sambhaji was afforded due to those visits to know properly the character and the attitude of the Rajput and the Mughal nobility of Aurangzeb towards the political activity undertaken in Maharashtra by Shivaji.

These matters are important in deciding the wrongfulness of Yuvaraj Sambhaji's desertion to Aurangzeb; his attacks on the Svarajya with the help of the Mughals and the asylum given by him after becoming the Chhatrapati to prince Akbar, the son of Aurangzeb.

(B) English

The English factories for trade were established after 1600 A.D. by the English East India Company with the permission of Indian rulers, at places like Bombay, fort St. George, Dharangaon, Karwar, Rajapur, Surat, etc. These factories were often in correspondence with each other in order to keep themselves well informed about the different matters which took place in their respective areas. This was essential for the safe conduct of their trade in India.

The records of the English factories in the Deccan and South India are of great value for the history of Sambhaji. Since the English had employed paid spies who travelled in the Deccan and supplied news to their different factories, we get mostly reliable information about many of the happenings in the Svarajya during the time of Shivaji and Sambhaji.

Much trustworthy information about the participation of Sambhaji in the administration of Shivaji, Sambhaji's desertion to Aurangzeb; Sambhaji's relations with the English when he became the Chhatrapati, etc. is available from these Factory Records. These records are more useful as they give dates of different events which are not given at times in the Marathi Sources. These English Factory records have been translated into Marathi by the scholars of the Bharata Itihas Samshodhaka Mandala, Poona, and are published in the volumes of the "Shivakalin Patrasara Sangraha".

In addition to those Volumes, the records of the English Factories are also published by the Shivacharitra Karyalaya, Poona, in English in the "English Records on Shivaji(1659-1682) in two volumes in 1931.

1. Records of Fort St. George - Dairy and Consultation Book of -

The English factories in India had, for every Factory, a President and a Council of Members to assist him in the affairs of the policy matters and the trade activity. In relation to those matters, they discussed in their Council, the different political events which took place in their areas. They also took decisions about the policy they were to pursue towards the neighbouring rulers whose political activities were going to affect the trade of their Factory. This work they did in consultation with each other and they also maintained the records of that work. The English Factory of St. George was in many ways concerned about the policy matters and the political activity conducted in

Karnataka* by the Maratha government at Jinji. Therefore, in those records we get much useful and trustworthy information about the Maratha activity in Karnataka pertaining to the period of Chhatrapati Sambhaji. These records being official in nature, their credibility as sources is high. Those have been published by the Madras Government, Madras.

(2) Records of Fort St. George-Letters to Fort St. George.

In these records we get trustworthy information about the activity of the Marathas in Karnataka which the English Factories at Tevenapattam (St. David) and Conimer have supplied to the Factory of Fort St. George.

Together with that, those records supply credible data of the dealings which those Factories in Karnataka had with the Maratha Government at Jinji.

(C) French

The French East India Company of France, which was granted a monopoly of trade with the East Indies by the French Sovereign Louis XIV on the 27th of August 1664, was the last trading company of Europe to appear in India to secure a share in the rich profits from the Eastern Trade.

On the basis of a Firman of the Mughal emperor, Aurangzeb, in 1666, the French East India Company established its first Factory at Surat in 1668. After establishing its other Factories at Rajapur on the Konkan Coast (1668), at

---

* Karnataka in the old days was the whole of South India.

Mirjan on the Malbar Coast (modern Karwar Coast) (1668), at Tellicherry and Masulipatam, on the Coromandel Coast(1670), the French East India Company secured a facility from Sherkhan, the Governor of Bijapur government in 1674, to establish its Factory at Pondicherry in Bijapur Karnataka. Monsieur Francois Martin, a Frenchman of remarkable energy acted as the Governor of the Factory at Pondicherry during 1674-1706. Under Martin, the French Factory of Pondicherry assumed great importance in the French activity in the Karnataka.

While carrying out his Factory duties, Martin maintained a Diary. He made daily entries in his diary of what he learnt, and composed from these, a Memoire or connected narrative. This diary of Martin was edited and published in 3 volumes in French by A. Martineau at Paris in 1931 - 1934, under the name " Memoires de Francois Martin."

(1) Memors, Vol.II and III of Francois Martin.

We have used in our work the material pertaining to Sambhaji's period which has been translated into English by Sir Jadu Nath Sarkar from the Memoires' Vols. II and III in his book, 'House of Shivaji ! (1955)

From that material, we get information about the matters which took place at Jinji, the seat of the Maratha administration in Karnataka after the accession of Sambhaji to the throne of Shivaji, the plot of Sambhaji's Ministers (whom Martin uniformly calls as the "Brahmins") against his life, the nature of Sambhaji's administration in general; Sambhaji's character and the state of affairs which developed in the Svarajya after the capture of Sambhaji by the Mughals.

In general, Martin's version about those events is based on the hearsay and therefore much of it is bound to be inaccurate and unsound as source material. But at certain points, his information about the events and the nature of the administration of Sambhaji finds corraboration in the Marathi sources.

(D) Kannada

Since the time of Shahaji Bhosle, the father of Chhatrapati Shivaji, the Marathas developed closer contact with the people of Karnataka*. After settling down at Bangalore, the seat of his Jagir given to him by the Sultan of Bijapur, Shahaji, conducted political activities in Karnataka. As a result of that, Shahaji, his sons Vyankoji and Shivaji, and Shivaji's son Sambhaji secured for themselves the friendship of some of the rulers and Nayakas in Karnataka and South India and together with that also earned the hostility of others - especially of the rulers of Mysore.

With the expedition of Chhatrapati Shivaji in Karnataka in 1676-1678, the territories of the Svarajya were extended in that area. The seat of the Maratha administration in Karnataka was Jinji. Its Chief Subhedars got involved from time to time in the political matters of Karnataka. As a result, the Svarajya often came in conflict with the rulers of the Kingdom of Mysore.

To trace the events of those conflicts and their result,

---

* From here the word Karnataka refers to the territory presently known as Karnataka and not the territory as designated by the Mughals which embrassed practically

the Kannada sources are helpful to the historian. The portions of some of those sources, which supply historical information about Chhatrapati Sambhaji and his administrators at Jinji have been translated in Marathi by Shri. P.B. Desai in the Shiv-Charitra-Vritta Samgraha (Khanda - I - Kanadi Vibhag), which is published by the Bharat Itihas Samshodhaka Mandala, Poona, in 1938.

Since the information of the Maratha affairs and politics in Karnataka is not sufficiently available in the sources in Marathi, the Kannada sources are of great value for the historian who wants to study the Maratha-Karnataka relations in the 17th century A.D.

(1) Apratima Vira Charitam

It is a work of poet Tirumalarya. The ruler of Mysore, Chikkadevaraya (1672-1704) had given patronage to Tirumalarya. Poet Tirumalarya has written in his poetic work, the Aprátima Vira Charitam, about many events which had taken place in the reign of Chikkadevaraya, whose one of the titles was the "Apratima Vira" (Unequalled Warrior).[2]

Since the subject which has been treated in the Apratima Vira Charitam is the "Figure of Speech", Tirumalarya, to specify its examples, has, in those examples, narrated the

---

2. Apratima Vira Charitam, p.30; Desai, P.B., Ed., A History Karnataka, p. 417.

bravery and different virtues of his patron, Chikkadevaraya.[3] Due to this reason and due to the fact that it is a poetic work, very less of the contents of the Apratima Vir Charitam can be accepted as credible in the historical analysis. Such credible contents have been translated in to Marathi by Shri. P.B. Desai. From those contents we get reliable information of the conflict of Chikkadevaraya with Chhatrapati Sambhaji and the administration of the Svarajya at Jinji.

(2) Chikkadevarajbinnapam

The ruler of Mysore, Chikkadevaraya (1672-1704), has composed the Kannada work, Chikkadevarajbinnapam, which he has offered at the feet of his family deity, Lord Narayana of Yadavgiri.

Though the work contains in it the Vedanta and other religious principles, in its introductory part, it contains historical information about the various achievements of Chikkadevaraya and the military victories which he won against the administrators of the Svarajya at Jinji. Though there exists much of exaggeration in that information, it is instrumental in giving us the credible idea of the friendly relations which Chikkadevaraya had established with the Mughal emperor Aurangzeb who had attacked the Svarajya during the reign of Chhatrapati Sambhaji.

We have used in our work the portions of the Chikkadevarajbinnapam which have been translated by Shri. P.B. Desai into Marathi.

---

3. Apratima Vira Charitam, p. 30.

(E) Marathi

The language of the rulers of the Svarajya was Marathi. In that, the areas and the people on whom they ruled were largely such that those used the Marathi language for most of the purposes of their life. That naturally made the Marathi as an official language of the Svarajya.

As a result of this, by a large degree, the official documents and letters of the Maratha government are available in the Marathi language. Since Marathi was largely the language of the subjects of the Svarajya, they have used that language for their papers of private transactions and for their writing of the family accounts, letters, diaries, etc. Those records constitute the primary and important sources for the history of the Marathas; and the more those are available for a particular period of Maratha history, the more they help the historian to shed true light on the complicated matters of that period.[4] Some such private records of different categories are available for the history of Chhatrapati Sambhaji.

Along with those historical records, we have the availability of the Bakhars (Accounts of Life) of Chhatrapati Shivaji the Great; Chhatrapati Sambhaji and Chhatrapati Rajaram, which are of great help in giving us meaningful credible facts about the early life of Sambhaji; his reign and the conditions which prevailed in the Svarajya as a

---

4. Rajwade Khanda II. Introduction, p.1.

result of his rule and of the period after his tragic capture by the Mughals.

(1) The Ajnapatra

The Ajnapatra is an important source in the Marathi language on the polity of the Svarajya.

Its authorship is ascribed to the great statesman of the Svarajya, Hukmat Panha Ramchandrapant Amatya Bavdekar.[5]

As Ramchandrapant was a minister under Chhatrapati Shivaji and Chhatrapati Sambhaji; and had risen to the highest position to which a minister could reach - Hukmatpanha, that is "a person whose orders even the Chhtrapati could not over rule"[6] under Chhatrapati Rajaram Ramchandrapant had gained valuable

---

5. Ajnapatra - Khare and Bhide, Introduction, Pp.5-12; Hukmatpanha Ramchandrapant Amatya Yanche Ajnapatra Ani Rajniti, Ed. Joshi,S.N. and Bhingare, L.M.,Introduction,Pp.6-16; Marathe Shahitil Rajniti Athava Ramchandrapant Amatya Bavdekar Likhit Ajnapatra, (Pub.A.A. Moramkar, Bombay,1923), Introduction, Sardesai,G.S., Pp.1-5; Potdar,D.V.,Pp.5-10; Sane, K.N., Pp.10-11; Amatya Krita Marathe Shahitil Rajniti - Ajnapatra, Ed., Joshi P.N. , Ajnapatra-Parichaya,Pp-5-19; Ajnapatra (Maratheshahitil Rajniti), Rao,V.D., Introduction Pp.5-15, regard that the Ajnapatra was written by Ramchandrapant Amatya. They have refuted the arguments by which that authorship is denied to Ramchandrapant Amatya by Kolte,V.B. , (Maratheshahitil Rajniti-Ajnapatra,Ed.,Garge,B.G. and Ghate,D.V., (2nd edition,1945,Pp.10-29); and Banahatti,S.N., Ed., Ajnapatra Arthat Shivaji Rajanchi Rajniti,Upotghat,Pp.1-45.

6. Chitnis Bakhar of Chhatrapati Rajaram -Juvekar,p.21.

experience in the administration of the Svarajya. Therefore, what he has written in the Ajnapatra about the polity of the Svarajya in the time of Shivaji, Sambhaji and Rajaram is of great value.

The Ajnapatra gives credible information about the conflict of Chhatrapati Sambhaji with Aurangzeb and the effects of that conflict on the Svarajya during the reign of Sambhaji.

(2) Chhatrapati Shri Shivaji Raje Yanchi Bakhar by Krishnaji Anant Sabhasad.

Krishnaji Anant Sabhasad was an assistant of Pralhad Niraji, who had acted as an ambassador and a Nyayadhish(judge) under Chhaptapati Shivaji.[7] It appears that Krishnaji Anant Sabhasad was in the administration of Shivaji since 1668. He seems to be a member of the council of Ministers of Shivaji.[8] Krishnaji Anant Sabhasad had accompanied Chhatrapati Rajaram, the younger son of Chhatrapati Shivaji, when Rajaram escaped from fort Panhala on 14th September, 1689[9] and reached Jinji in Karnataka on 2nd November, 1689.[10] These matters prove

---

7. Rajaram Charitam, Sarga IV, Verses 17-20, p.67; Joshi,S.N., Prastavana (Subhasad - Shivaji Bakhar, p.3).
8. Joshi, S.N., Ibid.
9. Rajaram Charitam, Sarga IV, Verses 1-23, Pp. 66-67.
10. Joshi,P.S., The Escape of Chhatrapati Rajaram to Jinji (QRHS Vol.X, No.2, p. 98)

that Krishnaji Anant Sabhasad was a responsible statesman in the administration of Chhatrapati Shivaji and Rajaram and he had an opportunity to be an eye witness to many of the events which had taken place in the lives of his masters. The information about his place in Sambhaji's administration is not available.

When Chhatrapati Rajaram was at Jinji he asked Krishnaji Anant Sabhasad to write the biography (Bakhar) of Chhatrapati Shivaji[11] and he completed the task on 13th March, 1697[12].

The Bakhar of Shivaji written by Sabhasad " is free from many of the legends and supernatural elements which bring discredit to the 91 Qalmi Bakhar (of Shivaji), and its author gives evidence of a higher intellect than Malkare's (Bakhar of Shivaji). But even the Sabhasad Bakhar, though written by a contemporary of Shivaji is not based on State-papers and written notes, because it was composed while Rajaram was closely besieged in Jinji Fort, to which he had escaped from Maharashtra by the skin of his teeth, leaving everything behind him, and after roving hither and thither in constant risk of capture. Such a master and his servants, running with their lives in their hands, before relentless pursuers, could not have burdened themselves with papers during their perilous flight across the entire Deccan Peninsula. Sabhasad's work, therefore, is entirely derived

---

11. Sabhasad - Shivaji Bakhar, para, 1 p.1.

12. Joshi, S.N., Prastavana (Sabhasad - Shivaji Bakhar, p.19)

from his memory - the half-obliterated memory of an old man who had passed through many privations and hardships. But he was a contemporary and servant of Shivaji (and therefore) Sabhasad's is still the most valuable Marathi account of Shivaji and our main source of information from the Maratha side".[13]

The Bakhar of Shivaji written by Sabhasad is important to us for the history of Chhatrapati Sambhaji for different reasons. The information given by Sabhasad that Yuvaraj Sambhaji deserted to Aurangzeb because of his "anger against Shivaji"[14] on 13th December, 1678, is very important. Sabhasad's contention about the cause of the desertion of Sambhaji to the Mughals is supported by the contemporary English records.[15] This important information given by Sabhasad is instrumental in absolving Sambhaji from the charge levelled against him by Malhar Ramrao Chitnis in his Bakhar of Shivaji that "Sambhaji committed an outrage on a married Brahman woman and when Shivaji intended to punish him for that offence, Sambhaji deserted to Aurangzeb"[16]; and which is held as true by historians like Grant Duff[17], Sardesai,G.S.[18] and Sarkar J.N.[19]

---

13. Sarkar - Shivaji and His Times, p.392.
14. Sabhasad - Shivaji Bakhar, para 104, Pp.92-93.
15. SPSS II, No.2092, p.628.
16. Chitnis, Shivaji Bakhar, para 29, p.236.
17. Grant Duff - HM-I, p. 235.
18. Saedesai - Shivaji, Pp.202-203.
19. Sarkar - Aurangzeb - IV, p. 222.

We also get trustworthy information from this Bakhar about the meeting which Chhatrapati Shivaji had with Sambhaji at fort Panhala when Sambhaji had returned from the Mughal camp. Krishnaji Anant Sabhasad has given in the Bakhar the talk which Chhatrapati Shivaji had, at the time of his death, with his ministers and others about the character of Sambhaji and the circumstances which would prevail in the Svarajya after his (Shivaji's) death. In the narration of that talk Sabhasad has ascribed many blamishes to Sambhaji like Sambhaji's adiction to wine and recourse to loose moral life which are not supported by available credible historical evidence. But the other things that Sambhaji will rule in a bad manner and lose his kingdom, etc. are supported by historical evidence and those communicate to us the purport of Sabhasad that Sambhaji was not a good king. His version in the Bakhar that Chhatrapati Rajaram would regain the territories of Svarajya which were lost by Sambhaji to Aurangzeb is also proved by the contemporary documents.

(3) Jedhe Yanchi Shakavali (Jedhe Shakavali).

The Shakavalis (Chronologies) maintained by the important families of the 17th and 18th centuries in Maharashtra form an important group of source material for the Maratha history.

Since those events were recorded mostly in chronological order for the knowledge of the members of the families who maintained those chronologies, the details of those chronologies have a large degree of credibility. That record was also expected to give correct information about the past events to the members of the future generation of those families.

These Shakavalis (chronologies) are of great value to the historian of the Maratha period as those supply to him in many cases the exact dates of the events which have been narrated by the authors of the Bakhars of Shivaji and Sambhaji without the mention of the dates of their occurance[20]. Out of the different extant Shakavalis which are of the period of Chhatrapati Shivaji, Sambhaji and Rajaram, the Jedhe Yanchi Shakavali is most important.

The Jedhe Shakavali is a skeleton chronology which was in the possession of the members of the Jedhe family of Poona. During the period of Shivaji, Sambhaji and Rajaram, the members of that Maratha noble family played an important part in the affairs of the Svarajya. Though the authors of the Jedhe Shakavali are not known, it can be said with certainty, that its writing out was meant to give correct information and knowledge about the events which took place in the Svarajya from time to time, to the members of the future generations of the Jedhe family.

The Jedhe Shakavali has in it the events recorded from 1618 to 1697 A.D. Those entries, most of which agree with the facts found in the Persian, English and French sources, have helped the historians of the Maratha period to fix correctly the dates and the years of the events of the life of Chhatrapati Shivaji, Sambhaji and

---

20. Bendre, V.S., Sadhana-Chikitsa, p. 168.

Rajaram. As a result, Jadu Nath Sarkar has stated that "The Jedhe Shakavali (in Marathi) is useful for dates and accurate information (however brief) about the home affairs of the Marathas".[21]

(4) Shivakalin Patra Sara Sangraha Vols. I-III

Shri Shivacharitra Karyalaya of Pooma has rendered a valuable service to the cause of research in Maratha history by publishing Vols.I and II of the above title in 1930.

In these volumes are given the summaries of 2340 letters and documents in different languages, which pertain to the period of Chhatrapati Shivaji and the early part of the life of Sambhaji upto 1682 A.D.

Vol. III of the above title which contains letters and documents numbering from 2341 to 2810 has been edited by the notable historian of the Maratha period, S.N. Joshi. S.N.Joshi has made this volume indispensable for the research scholars of the period of Chhatrapati Shivaji and the early life of Sambhaji by giving in it the conversion in the Hindu Calender system the eras of the Mughal emperors like Akbar, Jehangir, Shahajahan, Aurangzeb, and the first day of the Months of the Ilahi Calender system into the dates of the months of the Gregorian Calender. Together with this, he has also given in this volume the "Shivakalin Shakavali" (the chronological table) of the events in the period of Shivaji and the early life of

---

21. House of Shivaji, p. 214; Sarkar J., Maratha Family Records of the 17th Century(IHRC, IX, 1926,p.24).

Sambhaji after their proper verification with the credible data gleaned from the various contemporary sources.

Since the entries in these volumes give meaningful summaries of the portions of different sources for the history of Chhatrapati Shivaji and Sambhaji, they help the research scholars in finding out pertinent original sources of interest for their research.

(F) Mixed European Languages

(1) Storia do Mogor - by Niccalao Manucci, Edited and translated in English by Willian Irvine.

The work of Niccolao Manucci, Storia do Mogor, known as the Travels of Manucci [22] or the History of the Mughals[23] is a curious type of historical source. Though it is admitted that the Storia do Mogor has been originally written by Niccolao Manucci in different European languages - " in Portuguese, French and Italian, - about one-third of the whole work having been drawn up originally in his mother tongue Italian, and nearly the whole being rewritten in Portuguese mixed with French"[24], Jadunath Sarkar has put it under the category of the English source.[25] Other scholars[26] have also put it in the category of the English sources. Those scholars seem to have given more consideration

---

22. Sarkar, J., Shivaji and His Times, p. 398.
23. Sarkar,J., William Irvine, The Historian of the Later Mughals, (Studies in Mughal India, p.260).
24. Ibid.
25. Sarkar,J., Shivaji and his Times, p.398.
26. For Example, see - Hatalkar - French and the Marathas,p.283.

to the English language in which William Irvine, the notable historian of the Mughal India has translated it, than to the languages in which the original Storia do Mogor is written by Manucci. We feel that the proper way to classify the source-book is to take into account the language in which it is originally written. Since the Storia do Mogor is originally written by Manucci in more than one European languages and that also in a manner of mixed-up languages, we have placed it under the category of the sources in the "Mixed European Languages".

"Niccolao Manucci had left Venice in Novemember 1653 at the age of fourteen as a stowaway. Reaching India in January 1656, he took service under prince Dara Shukoh and latterly under Shah Alam. At intervals he set up practice as a doctor without any medical training, travelled all over India, went through various adventures and changes of fortune, and passed his old age at Madras and Pondicherry, dying in 1717. Thus his life in India covered more than sixty years. At different times he wrote his history of the Mughals (Storia do Mogor)[27] in 4 volumes. Out of those, we have used the IInd volume for the history of Sambhaji. Manucci had the fortune to become a Mansabder (Noble) in the service of prince Shah Alam on a salary of Rs.300/- per month[28].

---

27. Sarkar,J. William Irvine, the Historian of the Later Mughals, (Studies in Mughal India, p.260).

28. Storia do Mogor, II, p. 215.

This brought him in close contac-t with the prominent nobles of the court of Aurangzeb like Raja Jaisingh, Jaisingh's son, Kiratsingh,[29] and others.

As a result of these things, Manucci had a chance to learn correct information about many matters which took place in India and whose news was received in the court of Aurangzeb and in the higher circles of the Mughal officers. He seems to have made proper use of that knowledge in his work, Storia do Mogor.

In the Storia do Mogor, Manucci has given correct information about the daring night attack of Shivaji on the Mughal general Shahistekhan on 5th April, 1663; the visit of Shivaji to the court of Aurangzeb at Agra, Shivaji's confinement by Aurangzeb and the escape of Shivaji from the custody of Aurangzeb.

Manucci had accompanied Mirza Raja Jaisingh in his campaign against Shivaji in 1665 and had seen Shivaji when he had stayed in the camp of Jaisingh to settle the terms of the treaty of Purandar with the Mughals. Manucci has praised the character and valour of Shivaji in his Storia do Mogor and the information given by him about Shivaji is corroborated by the account of Shivaji's political activity written by the Mughal historians like Khafi Khan, who was a contemporary of Shivaji.

~~28. Storia do Mogar~~
29. Ibid., p.112.

For the history of Chhatrapati Sambhaji, Manucci has given much useful information in his Storia do Mogor. Mannuci, was present in Goa at the time when the war of Chhatrapati Sambhaji was going on against the Portuguese in 1683. Mannuci was in close contact with the Viceroy of Goa, Fracisco de Tavore, Conde de Alvor[30] andtherefore he has given correct account of the happenings of that war. He has given credible information about the terms of the treaty which the Portuguese settled with Chhatrapati Sambhaji to close that war. In the process of settling the terms between the Portuguese of Goa and Chhatrapati Sambhaji, Manucci had an occasion to visit Sambhaji on behalf of the Viceroy of Goa.[31]

The Storia do Mogor of Manucci also gives us authentic information about the conflict of prince Akbar, the fourth son of Aurangzeb, with Aurangzeb; the preparation of war by Akbar against Aurangzeb in Rajputana; the flight of Akbar to the Svarajya when Akbar's attempt to fight against Aurangzeb proved a failure and the patching up of a treaty by Aurangzeb with the Rajputs in order to come down himself personally to the Deccan to put down the menace of the alliance between Sambhaji and prince Akbar.

In spite of the fact that Manucci's work gives trusty-worthy information as shown above, it does not give credible information about some of the matters of the life of Sambhaji. This is because, he seems to have written

---

30. Ibid., p. 244.
31. Ibid., p. 249.

about them on the basis of the garbled news he had received from different people in the Mughal camp. For example, Manucci ascribes the desertion of Yuvaraj Sambhaji to the Mughals in 1678 to his desire of escaping from the punishment which Chhatrapati Shivaji wanted to give him for his unruly habit of "siezing other men's wives".[32] This cause which is given by Manucci for the desertion of Sambhaji to the Mughals is not supported by the contemporary English Factory Records and the Bakhar of Shivaji which is written by Krishnaji Anant Sabhasad who was a minister of Shivaji and a contemporary to the episode of the desertion of Yuvaraj Sambhaji. Similarly, the writing of Manucci that Kavi Kalash, the Chhandogamatya of Chhatrapati Sambhaji was in collusion with emperor Aurangzeb and therefore he delivered Sambhaji into the hands of Aurangzeb[33] is contradicted by the credible data which is available about the episode of the capture of Sambhaji by the Mughals in the Peshwa Daftar, Vol.XXXIX No.138, and the Tarabai Kalin Kagadpatre, Vol.I No.322.

The value of the Storia do Mogor in the reconstruction of the history of Chhatrapati Sambhaji is not high.

(G) Persian

For the reconstruction of the authentic history of the Svarajya and its rulers, the Persian sources are of great

---

32. Ibid., p. 190.
33. Ibid., p. 291.

importance. This is because the authors of those sources were either in the service of the Muslim rulers of the State of Bijapur or the Mughal rulers of Delhi against whom the rulers of the Maratha state were often in conflict. As a result, the authors of the Persian sources have written meaningful and many times exact information in their works about many matters which transpired between their rulers and the heads of the Maratha state from time to time. The value of the Persian sources lies in this fact that they give us exact dates of the events which they narrate.

We have taken into account the following important Persian sources to reconstruct the history of Chhatrapati Sambhaji.

(1) Futuhate Alamgiri of Ishwardas Nagar

The author of the Futuhate Alamgiri or "Alamgir Vijaya", Ishwardas Nagar, was resident of Patan in Gujarat. He was a clerk of the Chief Justice of Aurangzeb, Shaikh-ul-Islam (1675-1683). As Shaikh-ul-Islam was always required to be present with emperor Aurangzeb, Ishwardas Nagar had to stay in Aurangzeb's camp. As a result of this, Ishwardas Nagar was present in the camp of Aurangzeb when Aurangzeb came to the Deccan personally to stamp out the menace caused to his empire by the rebellion of his son, prince Akbar, who was given asylum by Chhatrapati Sambhaji. The camp of Aurangzeb moved from Burhanpur to Aurangabad and from there to Ahmednagar during 13th November,1681, to 13th November,

1683. Ishwardas Nagar was present in all these camps of Aurangzeb[34] and therefore he had an opportunity to learn the news which reached to the camp of Aurangzeb[35] about the conflict of Chhatrapati Sambhaji with Aurangzeb.

It seems that even after the resignation of Aurangzeb's Chief Justice, Shaikh-ul-Islam, who went on a pilgrimage to Mecca at the end of the year 1683, Ishwardas Nagar continued to stay in the camp of Aurangzeb upto at least september,1686. This is proved by the detailed description which he has given in the Futuhate Alamgiri about Aurangzeb's seige of Bijapur.[36]

After that Ishwardas served under the Mughal Subhedar of Gujarat, Shujaetkhan, as an Amin and Shiqdar (Revenue Collector) in certain Mahals of the Jodhpur Pargana which Aurangzeb had annexed on the death of Jaswantsingh in December 1678. There, he developed friendship with the Rathods and was successful in persuading Durgadas Rathod, the chief supporter of prince Akbar, the rebel son of Aurangzeb, to return to emperor Aurangzeb, Buland Akhtar and Safiyatunnissa, the son and the daughter respectively of prince Akbar, whom Akbar had left in the hands of the Rajputs at the time when he fled from Rajputana in 1681 to secure asylum under Chhatrapati Sambhaji. Aurangzeb, who was very much eager to recover his grand-children to preserve his family honour, then,

---

34. Futuhate Alamgiri - Pagadi, Introduction, p.3.
35. Sarkar,J., An Old Hindu Historian of Aurangzeb, (Studies in Mughal India, p.242).
36. Futuhate Alamgiri - Pagadi, Introduction, p.3,

bestowed favour on Ishwardas Nagar and granting him a jagir in Mairtha (in Marwar, west of Ajmir) made him a commander of 250 horse in rank.[37]

All these facts about the life of Ishwardas Nagar go on to prove that he being a person present in the camp of Aurangzeb during 13th November, 1681 to September 1686 had a chance to learn generally in authentic manner about the different events which took place during Sambhaji's war with Aurangzeb. The authenticity of the account of Ishwardas Nagar in his work, Futuhate Alamgiri or the Alamgir Vijaya is proved on the basis of the corroboration of those matters by the facts found in the other credible sources of the contemporary period.

For example, it is correctly stated by Ishwardas Nagar that "Chhatrapati Sambhaji had planned to send Prince Akbar with a big army in North India"[38] to attack the territories of the empire of Aurangzeb. This writing of Ishwardas Nagar is corroborated by the letter of Chhatrapati Sambhaji himself which Sambhaji has written to Raja Ramsingh of Amber in November 1682.[39] We also get credible information from the Futuhate Alamgiri about the movements of prince Akbar in Maharashtra till the time he left for Persia.[40]

---

37. Sarkar, J., An Old Hindu Historian of Aurangzeb, (Studies in Mughal India, Pp.243-246).
38. Futuhate Alamgiri - Pagadi, p. 19.
39. Sarkar - House of Shivaji, p. 207.
40. Futuhate Alamgiri - Pagadi, Introduction, p. 5.

But in the Futuhate Alamgiri Ishwardas Nagar has not given the dates of the events which he has narrated.[41] Similarly, the matters which he has stated about Shivaji's attack on Shahistekhan that the Maratha troops attacked Shahistekhan in the night time in his military camp and kidnapped his daughter / are incredible as those are not supported by the account of that episode given in other credible contemporary sources. The contemporary sources affirm that Shivaji himself, by entering in the dwelling place of Shahistekhan had attacked him in the night and in that attack severed the thumb of Shahistekhan by his sword.[42]

The incredibility of this episode in the Futuhate Alamgiri can be ascribed to the fact that Ishwardas Nagar who came to the Deccan with Aurangzeb in November, 1681, has written about the matters of Shivaji on the basis of garbled accounts heard by him from others.

We have used the Marathi translation of the Futuhate Alamgiri rendered by Setu Madhavarao Pagadi in his work Mogol Maratha Sangharsh (Farsi Sadhane).

(2) Massir-i-Alamgiri of Muhammad Saqi Mustaidkhan

Muhammad Saqi Mustaidkhan was the Diwan and the

---

41. Ibid.

42. Jedhe Shakavali, p. 22; Jedhe Yancha Karina, p.46; Storia do Mogor II, p. 97; Massir-i-Alamgiri - Khare, p.92.

Munshi (writer) of Bakhtavarkhan who was an officer over the personal servants of emperor Aurangzeb. After the death of Bakhtavarkhan in February 1685, Aurangzeb employed Muhammad Saqi Mustaidkhan in his own personal service. Upto the death of Aurangzeb (1707), Muhammad Saqi Mustaidkhan worked in different departments of the Mughal administration.

During the Deccan campaign of emperor Aurangzeb (1681-1707), Muhammad Saqi Mustaidkhan was in his personal service. As a result of this, he was present in the camp of Aurangzeb at Aurangabad, Ahmednagar, Sholapur, Bijapur, Golkonda, Galgali, Brahmapuri, Bahadurgad, Koregaon, Satara, Parali, Miraj, Panhalgad, Vishalgad, Sinhagad, ~~Pune~~ Poona, Rajgad, Torana, Khed, Wakinkheda, Devapur, etc. This gave Muhammad Saqi Mustaidkhan a good opportunity to observe and study properly from close quarters the nature of emperor Aurangzeb and his various policy matters. On the basis of that knowledge and the events which he had witnessed himself; and the information which he acquired from the top rank and faithful officers of Aurangzeb about the different happenings in the Deccan, he has written his work, the Massir-i-Alamgiri. As in his historical work, Muhammad Saqi Mustaidkhan has given an account of the expeditions of Aurangzeb, the victories he scored against his enemies, etc., he has given to his work the title Massir-i-Alamgiri (Achievements of Aurangzeb).[43]

---

43. Massir-i-Alamgiri - Pagadi, Introduction, Pp.1-2.

The Massir-i-Alamgiri is of great importance for the reconstruction of the history of Chhatrapati Sambhaji's clash with Aurangzeb as in it Muhammad Saqi Mustaidkhan has given exact dates of the events which took place in that conflict.

The Massir-i-Alamgiri is useful for the history of Chhatrapati Sambhaji as it gives us authentic information about the desertion of Chimnaji of Khadgagad[44] to Aurangzeb. It also gives us trustworthy data about the friendly relations which existed between the kings of Bijapur, Golkonda and Sambhaji who had made a common cause to resist jointly the invasion of Mughal emperor Aurangzeb on their respective kingdoms.[45]

Muhammad Saqi Mustaidkhan was present in the camp of emperor Aurangzeb when Sambhaji, who was captured alive by Shaikh Nizam alias Mukarrab Khan was brought before Aurangzeb in that camp.[46] The cruel treatment which Aurangzeb gave to Chhatrapati Sambhaji and the manner in which Aurangzeb put him to death is graphically narrated by Muhammad Saqi Mustaidkhan in the Massir-i-Alamgiri.[47] It is pertinent to note that according to Muhammad Saqi Mustaidkhan, Aurangzeb put Sambhaji to death because the

---

44. Massir-i-Alamgiri - Pagadi, p.22.
45. Ibid. Pp.30-31.
46. Ibid. Introduction, p.7.
47. Ibid. Pp.38-42.

Muslim priests and the nobles advised him to put an end to Sambhaji's life as he had proved to be a source of great trouble to the Muslim empire of Aurangzeb.[48]

The Massir-i-Alamgiri is thus the most important contemporary source for the reconstruction of the history of Sambhaji.

In our work, for the purpose of the data related to the activity of Shivaji and for the early life of Sambhaji we have used the Marathi translation rendered by G.H. Khare of the Massir-i-Alamgiri in the issues of the BISM, which is also published in the Siva Charitra Vritta Sangraha Khanda III (Farsi Vibhag). For the purpose of obtaining the historical facts pertaining to the reign of Sambhaji (1680-1689), we have used the Marathi translation of the relevant portions of the Massir-i--Alamgiri rendered by Setu Madhavarao Pagadi in his book Marathe Va Aurangzeb.

3) Muntakhabullubbab of Muhammad Hashim Khafikhan

Even though Muhammad Hashim Khafikhan has himself given the name to his work as the Muntakhabullubbab-i--Muhammadshahi, it is commonly known as the Muntakhabull-ubbab as well as the Tarikh-i-Khafikhan.

Muhammad Hashim Khafikhan is also known by other names like Hashim Alikhan as well as Khafikhan.

---

48. Ibid., p. 41.

It is regarded by some scholars[49] that Muhammad Hashim acquired the name as Khafikhan because originally his family belonged to the region named Khaf, in Iran. Khafikhan completed the writing of his work, Muntakhabullubbab in 1734 A.D.[50]

Muhammad Hashim Khafikhan is also well known by his other name - Nizamulmulki. This is because he had acted as the Diwan of Nizamulmulk, the Mughal Viceroy of the Deccan. Khafikhan, in the capacity of the Diwan served him for two years from 1713 A.D. at Aurangabad (Deccan).[51]

In his historical work, Muntakhabullubbab, Khafikhan has written the history of the ancestors of Babar, the first Mughal emperor in India who founded his dynasty at Delhi in 1526 A.D. In it, Khafikhan has narrated the history of the Mughal dynasty upto the 14th year of the reign (1733) of Muhammad Shah (1719-1748). The history from Babar to emperor Akbar has been given by Khafikhan in a brief manner. After that, the history of the next 130 years has been elaborately written by Khafikhan in his work. Of that history of 130 years, the events which had taken place in the last 53 years were either seen and experienced by Khafikhan himself or he had heared about those matters from the persons who had

---

49. Khafikhan - Pagadi, Introduction, 1. Though it is stated in the work that Khaf is a town, Shri.Pagadi has explained to me in a talk that Khaf is a region and not a town.
50. Khafikhan - Pagadi, Introduction, p.1.
51. Ibid.

THE UNIVERSITY OF

actually seen them or whose course of life was affected by those events.[52]

From the scanty information which is available in the Muntakhabullubbab of Khafikhan we learn that his father was in the service of prince Murad, the younger brother of emperor Aurangzeb. When Aurangzeb defeated prince Murad, the father of Khafikhan entered in the service of Aurangzeb (1657-1658).

Khafikhan was in the Mughal service and was carrying out the work of keeping a watch on the Ghats of river Narmada in the territory which was under Raja Mohansingh and which was at a distance of eight kos (16 miles) from Akbarpur a place from where prince Akbar, the rebel son of emperor Aurangzeb, had crossed the Narmada after his discomfeature in Rajaputana with the purpose of seeking asylum under Chhatrapati Sambhaji in the Svarajya. In 1682, Khafikhan was present in the camp of the Mughal army which had laid siege to the Maratha fortress of Ramsej (in the Nasik District).

It is not clear as to in what capacity Khafikhan was in the service of emperor Aurangzeb during 1682 and upto the time of the fall of the kingdom of Golkonda in September, 1687. It seems that after the fall of Golkonda, Khafikhan went to Ahmedabad with Muhammad

---

52. Khafikhan - Khare, Pp. 61-62.

Mudrakhan alias Sadatkhan, a favourite officer of Aurangzeb, whom, Aurangzeb had appointed as the Wakenavis at Ahmedabad.[53]

From that time to the time of the fall of Raigad in 1689, the details of the whereabouts of Khafikhan and the work done by him in the Mughal administration are not known. It seems from his expressions like "It is said that" while narrating the event of the bringing of Sambhaji by the captor of Sambhaji, Shaikh Nizam alias Mukarrabkhan to the camp of emperor Aurangzeb[54] at Bahadurgad and the event of Aurangzeb's putting to death Chhatrapati Sambhaji and Sambhaji's minister Chhandogamatya Kavi Kalash, that at that time Khafikhan was not present in the camp of Aurangzeb. But since he had learnt the details of those events from the responsible officers of Aurangzeb when he was an assistant of Abdul Razak Lari, the Fauzdar of Raigad during 1690-1693 A.D., credance can be ascribed to the information given by Khafikhan about those events.*

Khafikhan seems to have died at a ripe old age ~~and age~~ and to have gone through the thicks and thins of life in the Mughal service upto the time of his suspension

---

53. Khafikhan - Pagadi, Introduction, p.2.

54. Khafikhan - Pagadi, Pp. 18-19.

* I owe this interpretation to Shri. Pagadi.

from service sometime in 1718.[55] Though in his work, Muntakhabullubbab, Khafikhan has given the historical account of the Mughal empire upto 1733 A.D., we have taken into consideration its portions upto the year 1689 which pertain to the reigns of Shivaji,and the early life of Sambhaji and the reign of Chhatrapati Sambhaji.

We have used in our work, the Marathi translation rendered by G.H. Khare of the Muntakhabullubbab in the Quarterly issues of the Bharat Itihasa Samshodhaka Mandala, Poona. That translation is also published by the Bharat Itihasa Samshodhaka Mandala, Poona in the Shiva Charitra Vritta Samgraha (Khanda III, Farsi Vibhag). That translation is of use to reconstruct the history of the period of Shivaji which also covers the period of the early life of Sambhaji. For the reconstruction of the history of the reign of Sambhaji, we have used the Marathi translation of the Muntakhabullubbab given by Setu Madhavrao Pagadi in his book, Marathyanche Swatantrya Yuddha (Kafikhana-cha Sadhana Grantha).

4) Tarikh-i-Dilkusha of Bhimsen Saxena

Tarikh-i-Dilkusha is a very important contemporary Persian source for the history of Chhatrapati Sambhaji.

Its author, Bhimsen Saxena, was in the Mughal service

---

55. Khafikhan - Pagadi, Introduction, Pp.3-4.

since 1667 to 1709. He undertook the writing of his work, Tarikh-i-Dilkusha (Manoram Itihas), in 1700[56] and completed it in 1709 after his retirement from that service.[57]

Tarikh-i-Dilkusha is an autobiography of Bhimsen Saxena and in it he has narrated the various events to which he was an eye witness.

From the Tarikh-i-Dilkusha we get much credible data pertaining to the political activities of Shivaji, the early life of Sambhaji and the period of Sambhaji's reign (1680-1689). This is because of the fact that during his total service in the Mughal administration from 1665 to 1709, Bhimsen Saxena was mostly in Maharashtra. Bhimsem Saxena, who worked as a Mushraf (Examiner of Accounts), was well acquainted with the Mughal statesmen, like Shahajada Muazzam and Maharaja Jaswantsingh. He was also in close contact with the Mughal commanders like Daudkhan, Mahabatkhan, and Dilerkhan. After when Bhimsen Saxena was appointed as a Secretary of Rao Dalpat Bundela, the trusted Rajput commander of emperor Aurangzeb, Bhimsen came in close contact with famous Mughal Commander, Zulfikar Khan. As a result, Bhimsen was present in the Mughal siege of the fortresses Ahivant, Naldurga, Ramsej, Jinji, Panhala, etc. He was also present on the site of

---

56. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha - Pagadi, Introduction, p.7.

57. Ibid., p.9.

the various battles which the Mughals fought against the Marathas.[58]

From the Tarikh-i-Dilkusha, we learn about Shivaji's sending Sambhaji as a Mansabdar of five thousand rank in the camp of Shahajada Muazzam at Aurangbad on 4th November, 1667, when Shivaji had established peaceful relations with Aurangzeb, after his famous escape from the Mughal custody at Agra. After Sambhaji had stayed for a few days in the camp of Shahajada Muazzam, Shivaji requested for the withdrawal of Sambhaji from that camp on the grounds that "he was a small boy; and laterwards, when he becomes mature in age he would be sent again to serve Shahajada Muazzam in his camp." This request of Shivaji was granted, and the persons under Jaswantsingh, brought back Sambhaji to Shivaji. However, as a Navab (representative) of Sambhaji, Prataprao stayed at Aurangabad in the camp of Shahajada Muazzam to render service to the Mughals as was agreed by Shivaji.[59] These matters stated by Bhimsen are trustworthy because when those had taken place, he was present in the camp of Shahajada Muazzam at Aurangabad.[60]

Bhimsen Saxena has also stated in the Tarikh-i--Dilkusha that Yuvaraj Sambhaji deserted to the Mughals

---

58. Ibid., p. 11.
59. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha - Pagadi, Pp.24-25.
60. Tarikh-i-Dilkisha - Pagadi, Introduction, p.2.

on 13th December, 1678, because he was angry with Shivaji.[61] What Bhimsen has stated about the cause of Yuvaraj Sambhaji's desertion to the Mughals is truthful not only because he himself was present in the camp of Mughal general Dilerkhan at that time[62] but because in that matter he is supported by the data gleaned about that episode from the contemporary English Factory Records, and the Bakhar of Shivaji written by Krishnaji Anant Sabhasad.

Bhimsen has narrated about the escape of Yuvaraj Sambhaji to Shivaji from the camp of Dilerkhan which was at Athani at that time. From that narration we come to know that Chhatrapati Shivaji's men used to visit Sambhaji secretly and they helped Sambhaji to escape from the camp of Dilerkhan.[63] What Bhimsen has stated in the Tarikh-i-Dilkusha about the escape of Sambhaji from the camp of Dilerkhan is correct, as it is supported by the contents of that matter written in the letter of Shivaji to his younger step-brother, Vyankoji, the ruler of Tanjore;[64] as well as by the data found in the English Factory Records.[65]

---

61. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha,-Pagadi, Pp.70-71.
62. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha,- Pagadi, Introduction, p.4.
63. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha - Pagadi, p.73.
64. SPSS-II, No. 2236, p. 684.
65. Ibid., No.2142,p.642.

The narration of Bhimsen about the unsuccessful Mughal siege of the Maratha fortress of Ramsej in October, 1682 is trustyworthy as at that time Bhimsen was present in camp of the Mughal army which had besieged it.[66] His eye witness account of that Mughal siege is also supported by the Muntakhabullubbab of Muhammad Hashim Khafikhan who, like Bhimsen, was also present in the Mughal camp at that time.[67]

Bhimsen has correctly narrated in the Tarikh-i-Dilkusha about the asylum given by Sambhaji to prince Akbar,[68] and coming down personally to the Deccan of emperor Aurangzeb for the purpose of putting down both of them.[69]

The Tarikh-i-Dilkusha is of much use for obtaining the credible details of the conflict which Sambhaji had with emperor Aurangzeb from 1681 to 1689.

At the time when Chhatrapati Sambhaji was brought as a captive before Aurangzeb by Shaikh Nizam alias Mukarrabkhan at Bahadurgad, Bhimsen Saxena was present.[70] He has narrated the cruel treatment which emperor Aurangzeb gave to Sambhaji and Kavi Kalsh.[71] It is pertinent to note that in the narration of that episode, Bhimsen has not stated

---

66. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha - Pagadi, p.81.
67. Khafikhan - Pagadi, Pp.9-11.
68. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha-Pagadi, p. 78.
69. Ibid., p. 80.
70. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha - Pagadi, Introduction, p.5.
71. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha - Pagadi, Pp. 99-100.

that Sambhaji hurled abuses towards emperor Aurangzeb and Prophet Muhammad. This is in agreement with the Massir-i--Alamgiri of Muhammad Saqi Mustaidkhan who also was present in the camp of Aurangzeb at that time.[72] This absolves Sambhaji from the charge which Jadunath Sarkar has made against him.[73]

But the account given by Bhimsen Saxena of the capture of Sambhaji by Shaik Nizam alias Mukarrabkhan seems to have been based on the garbled accounts of that episode and hence is not correct. For example, Bhimsen's contention that Sambhaji was under the intoxication of wine during the time of his capture[74] is not correct. From the credible data available in the Marathi documents[75] it is proved that on the day on which Sambhaji was attacked and captured alive by Shaikh Nizam alias Mukarrabkhan, Sambhaji, just prior to that event, had attended and had given his judicial verdict on a very complicated and long outstanding Vatan dispute. When we take into account the complicated nature of that Vatan case and the elaborate judicial procedure which the Maratha administration used to follow to resolve such cases, it is not possible to accept the version of Bhimsen Saxena.

---

72. Massir-i-Alamgiri - Pagadi, Introduction, p.7.
73. Sarkar - Aurangzib IV, Pp. 402-403; Pagadi, S.M., - Hindavi Svarajya Ani Mogal, p. 86.
74. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha, p. 98.
75. TKK-I, No.143, p. 195; No. 322, p.472.

In our work we have used the Marathi translation of the Tarikh-i-Dilkusha given by Setu Madhavrao Pagadi in his book, Mughal Ani Marathe.

(H) Sanskrit

Out of the Sanskrit sources of the period of Sambhaji, we have used in our work mainly the following sources in the Sanskrit language which gives credible facts for the reconstruction of the history of Sambhaji

(1) The Budhabhushana of King Shambu

The Budhabhushana is a Sanskrit poetic work written bySambhaji. This is clearly stated in the verses 15-16 of the first section of the Budhabhushana.[76]

Though V.S. Bendre has given the probable period of the starting of the writing of the Budhabhushana by Sambhaji before October 1677, he has not given the period of the completion of that work by Sambhaji. We feel that Sambhaji must have completed the writing of the Budhabhushana before he deserted to emperor Aurangzeb on 13th December, 1678. For, after his desertion, Sambhaji's life became topsy-turvy and in it, he does not appear to have got the calmness of mind and peaceful atmosphere which is essential to complete the writing of a literary work. After his desertion to the time of his return to the Svarajya on 21st December,1679,[77]

---

76. Budhabhushana - Velankar, p.2, Introduction,p.XIV.

77. Sambhaji Shakavali, p. 101.

Sambhaji spent life in conducting anti-Svarajya activities. Then to the time of his execution by Aurangzeb on 11th March, 1689; his life was spent in agony and frustration till the death of Chhatrapati Shivaji and the struggle against his opponents to acquire Shivaji's throne; and in fighting mortal wars against the Siddis, Portuguese and the Mughals.

Taking into account these facts of the life of Sambhaji, we feel that Sambhaji, who began the writing of the Budhabhushana before October, 1677, seems to have completed that work before his desertion to the Mughals on 13th December, 1678. During the period October 1676 to December 1678, before going on the Karnataka expedition, Chhatrapati Shivaji had shifted Yuvaraj Sambhaji from Raigad and had placed him at Shringarpur. Therefore, at Shringarpur, Yuvaraj Sambhaji seems to have completed the writing of the Budhabhushana.

Kamal Gokhale is also of the view that Sambhaji wrote the Budhabhushana at Shringarpur.[78] She has based that view on the data which we get in the Paramanandakavya about the way in which Yuvaraj Sambhaji spend life at Shringarpur.

The Budhabhushana of Sambhaji has three chapters.

In the first chapter, Sambhaji has offered praises to Lord Gajanana, Shiva, Guru, and the Goddess Bhavani and

---

78. Gokhale - Sambhaji, p. 56, 434.

Parvati. In it he has given in brief, the history of his family. Sambhaji has incorporated in this chapter, many Subhashitas (Elegant Sayings) which are quotations from earlier ancient well-known authors.

In the Second chapter, Sambhaji has written 632 verses which relate to the science of Politics. "The author here deals with the following subjects, of course always in verses cited from other works, usually from the Matsya and Vishnudharmottara Puranas and the Kamandakiyanitisara. The king and his qualifications; his assistants; the prime minister; the princes; their education and duties; king's advisers; the other component parts of a kingdom: a-Kosha; b - Rashtra; c - Durga and its equipment; d - Bala i.e. army; King's duties; spies; attendants; councillors and the counsel; ambassador; king's duties; king's vices; invasion; king's duties in general."[79]

In the third chapter of the Budhabhushana, Sambhaji has given miscellaneous information useful to the princes.

Taking an over-all view of the Budhabhushana of Sambhaji, H.D. Velankar is of the opinion that it scarcely contains "anything of either literary or historical importance".[80]

Though the Budhabhushana is a work of no literary importance, we find that for the history of the early life of Sambhaji it gives us valuable data.

---

79. Budhabhushana - Velankar, Introduction, Pp.XI-XII.

80. Ibid., p. IX.

In its verse 14 of the first chapter, in which Sambhaji has given a brief history of his family, he has stated that Chhatrapati Shivaji had "honest hereditary ministers"[81].

The writing of Sambhaji about the ministers of Chhatrapati Shivaji that they were "honest" in the Budhabhushana whose writing he started before October 1677 and completed it at Shringarpur before his desertion to Aurangzeb (13th December, 1678) disproves the thesis of some historians that the ministers of Shivaji were " untruthful"[82]; the ministers of Shivaji were instrumental in starting and fomenting the internal quarrels (Antastha Kalaha) between themselves and Sambhaji;[83] they"goaded" Chhatrapati Shivaji to deny Yivaraj (Crown prince) Sambhaji his right of the Yuvaraj to govern the Svarajya during the time of Shivaji's Karnataka expedition (October, 1676 to May 1678)[84]; and as a result of those ministers' instigation when Shivaji gave treatment of insult it was that Yuvaraj Sambhaji deserted the Svarajya and went over to the Mughals "to live a life of honour and dignity"[85].

Similarly, the above stated data from the Budhabhushana about the ministers of Chhatrapati Shivaji is instrumental in disproving the contention which is in vogue that "the

---

81. Budhabhushana - Velankar, Verse 14, p.2.
82. Bendre - Sambhaji, p.66.
83. Ibid., Pp. 110-120.
84. Ibid., Pp.64,66.
85. Ibid., Pp. 73-77.

subjects of Chhatrapati Shivaji who were put to harassment by his ministers, used to come to Sambhaji at Shringarpur and Sambhaji used to console them and give them relief"[86]. For, had the ministers of Chhatrapati Shivaji put to harassment his subjects, Sambhaji, who wrote the Budhabhushana at Shringarpur itself, would never have called these ministers as "honest" in that work.

Since those historians have not taken into account this meaningful data given about Shivaji's ministers by Sambhaji in the Budhabhushana, their works on Chhatrapati Sambhaji fail to give us the authentic picture of the early life of Sambhaji, and his real motivation of deserting the Svarajya, and join the Mughals against Chhatrapati Shivaji.

(2) Shri Chhatrapati Sambhaji Maharajanche Danapatra of 24th August, 1680 - (Bakre Danapatra of Sambhaji)

This Danapatra of Chhatrapati Sambhaji, which is originally in the Sanskrit language, has been translated into Marathi and published in her work "Shivaputra Sambhaji" byKamal Gokhale in 1971. It is available in original in the collection of the unpublished historical documents of Mahamahopadhyaya D.V. Potdar of Poona.[87]

Since D.V. Potdar has written the " Ashirwad " (Blessings) to this work,[88] we regard that the Marathi

---

86. Gokhale - Sambhaji, Pp.56-57.
87. Gokhale - Sambhaji, p.432.
88. Ibid., Pp. 3-6.

translation of the above stated Sanskrit Danapatra of Chhatrapati Sambhaji given in this work is authentic.

From historical point of view, since on this Danapatra exist the seals of Chhatrapati Sambhaji and his ministers,[89] it is an official document of the government of Chhatrapati Sambhaji. Therefore, the historical facts which we get in it are of highest authenticity in the history of Sambhaji.

That Danapatra has been given by Sambhaji to a priest who was the son of Namadev Bhatta Bakre of the sacred place, Parashuram (in Konkan). That priest has been called by Sambhaji in the Danapatra. as the "Shrestha Mahamantrika" (a great Sorcerer). In it, Sambhaji has stated that when he had gone for a pilgrimage (earlier to his becoming the Chhatrapati) to Shikhar Shinganapur, he prayed and vowed to grant yearly a sum of ten thousand gold coins hereditarily to that priest, at the time when he would become the Chhatrapati. That vow, Sambhaji fulfilled through this Danapatra, after becoming the Chhatrapati.

These details conclusively prove that Sambhaji, in the days earlier to his becoming the Chhatrapati as well as after becoming the Chhatrapati, was under the influence of sorcery and the sorcers.

This peculiar aspect of Sambhaji's personality is not brought out by V.S. Bendre in his work even though in his

---

89. Ibid., Pp.432-434.

article[90] which he has written earlier to the writing of his work on Sambhaji, he has used some of the contents of this Danapatra. Like V.S. Bendre, Kamal Gokhale has also not taken into account this valuable data. Therefore, their works on Sambhaji, have failed to give an accurate picture of the character of Sambhaji.

In this Danapatra, Sambhaji has stated that the ministers of Shivaji were against him. They poisoned the mind of Queen Soyarabai (the step-mother of Sambhaji and the mother of prince Rajaram, the younger son of Shivaji) by saying that the eldest son of Shivaji (Sambhaji) should not be allowed to inherit the kingdom of Shivaji. Due to the partiality of Shivaji towards Soyarabai, Shivaji's opinion became against him (Sambhaji). Therefore, he abandoned the Svarajya and joined the Mughals (against Shivaji).

All this is a fabricated story constructed by Sambhaji, For, we do not find any support to this story in the extant credible sources. Sambhaji, after deserting the Svarajya, had, as he himself has truly admitted in the Danapatra, in collusion with the Mughal general Diler Khan attacked

---

90. Bendre V.S. - Yesubai, Shahu Va Rajaram Yanchetil Sneha Sambandha - Lekhanka I, (Navakal, Marathi Daily, Bombay, dated 10th June, 1927, p.2). In it, Shri.Bendre has referred to this Danapatra of Sambhaji which was read by Prof. D.V. Potdar at a meeting of the Bharata Itihasa Samshodhaka Mandal, Poona, in 1926.

and conquered Bhupalgad, a fortress which belonged to the Svarajya. To cover that guilt, which he had committed earlier against the Svarajya, Sambhaji, who was not a straight-minded ruler, has fabricated that story after becoming the Chhatrapati. V.S. Bendre and Kamal Gokhale, have accepted the story as true in their works to justify his desertion to the Mughals even though it does not stand to the tests of scientific historical analysis. As a result, their works, fail to give us the correct version about the character and life of Sambhaji.

(3) Paramanandakavya of Kavindra Paramanda

Paramanandakavya is a Sanskrit poetic work. Though the name of that work indicates that it is composed by poet Paramananda, in actuality, it seemed to J. Sarkar[91] that it has in it, in a put together form, the poetic compositions of Kavindra Paramananda, the court poet of Chhatrapati Shivaji; and some disciple-assistant of his; and of his (Paramananda's) grand-son, Govinda II. G.S. Sardesai[92] held the view that in the Paramanandakavya we have the different poetic compositions written by Kavindra Paramananda, Devadatta (son of Paramananda) and Govinda (the grand-son of Paramananda). J. Sarkar felt that Kavindra Paramananda died probably in 1687 and his school of learning and of poetical composition evidently ended with him. His school was revived by the grand-son of Paramananda, Govinda, who was in the

---

91. Sarkar, J., Foreword, (Paramanandakavya, Pp.1-3).
92. Sardesai, G.S., Introduction, (Paramanandakavya, Pp.12-15).

court of Chhatrapati Shahu (1708-1749), the son of Chhatrapati Sambhaji and therefore we have some of Govinda's compositions in the Paramanandakavya.[93] G.S. Sardesai[94] held the view that Kavindra Paramananda survived Chhatrapati Sambhaji's rule. He felt that some of the chapters, particularly those, which are on Shivaji, have been composed by Kavindra Paramananda himself.

As to when did Kavindra Paramananda die is not known to us as there is no mention about his death in the extant historical records.[95] Therefore, it is almost a problem before the historians to decide whether there exist any compositions of Kavindra Paramananda in the Paramanandakavya; and if at all those exist; to find out as to which can be ascribed to him in the compositions of the Paramanandakavya which belong evidently to different poets.

On the basis of the historical analysis of the Paramanandakavya, T.S. Shejwelkar held the view that in it there does not exist any compositions of Kavindra Paramananda, and the poetic compositions published in it belong to Devadatta (son of Kavindra Paramananda) and Govinda (the grand-son of Kavindra Paramananda).[96] D.V. Chauhan[97] has

---

93. Sarkar, J., Foreward, (Paramanandakavya, Pp. 2-3).
94. Sardesai, G.S., Introduction (Paramanandakavya, p.14).
95. Ibid.
96. Shejwalkar, Paramanandaputrakrita 'Anupurana' Kavyanche Parikshana, (Shiva Chhatrapati, p.131).
97. Chauhan, Paramanandakavya-Paramanandache Navhe, (Dakkhini Hinditil Itihas, Pp.209-230).

also arrived to the same conclusion on the basis of a deeper analysis of the Paramanandakavya.*

However it might be, the value of the Paramanandakavya in the history of Sambhaji is great. For, the poet, whoever he might be, who has written the compositions related to the coronation of Chhatrapati Sambhaji in the Paramanandakavya seems to have been present at the time of the coronation of Sambhaji at Raigad. We feel so because we find that the good treatment of honour which Sambhaji gave to his step-mother, Soyarabai, prince Rajaram, her son, and others (even when after the death of Shivaji they had tried to deny Sambhaji his legitimate right to his throne by performing the Manchakarohana ceremony of Rajaram), on that occasion and which is narrated by the poet in the Paramanandakavya[98] is corroborated by the evidence found in the contemporary English Factory Records.[99] This shows that in the

---

* Shri. Setu Madhavrao Pagadi has explained to me that Paramananda, the author of the Shiva Bharata, is not the author of the Paramanandakavya. This is because Paramananda has stated in the Shiva Bharata that in the episode of Afzalkhan, Shivaji was hit on head by Krishnaji Bhaskar; but in the Paramanandakavya it is stated that it was Afzalkhan who hit Shivaji on head. Had Paramananda been the author of the Paramanandakavya, he would have stated in it the name of Krishnaji Bhaskar only.

98. Paramanandakavya, Section III, Canto IV, Verses, p.42.

99. SPSS-II, No.2265, p.693; Sambhaji Shakavali, Pp.103-104.

Paramanandakavya the information of Sambhaji is given by a contemporary.

In the scientific historical analysis, high authenticity is ascribed to the account of a contemporary, provided the writer is honest, of good intentions, impartial and rational in ideas. If we apply these tests to the Paramanandakavya, we find that its author was not an honest person. He does not appear to be even rational. He is devoid of any sense of patriotism. Therefore, he has not expressed any sentiments of joy or satisfaction about the success of Shivaji to found the Svarajya to free his people from the intolerant Muslim rulers. Though he owed his position of the court poet of the Svarajya to Shivaji, he has not expressed in his work, any sentiments of joy and pride about the glorious achievements of Shivaji. In fact, in his work, the degree of highest irrationality is reached when he tells us that the Goddess, to stop whose molestation at the hands of the intolerant Muslims, Shivaji founded the Svarajya, told Yuvaraj Sambhaji to desert to the Mughals.[100] The poet has also gone to the extent of calling Shivaji's actions as "improper" when Shivaji reconquered the territories he had lost to Aurangzeb by the Treaty of Purandar in 1665.[101]

---

100. Paramanandakavya, Verses 37-64, Pp. 71-73.

101. Ibid., Verses 57-61, p. 55.

Taking into account these facts, it becomes clear that the Paramanandakavya is a source which is written with perverted inclinations.

Though the Paramanandakavya is a biased and irrational source, both, V.S. Bendre and Kamal Gokhale, without conducting its scrutiny as shown above, have used its contents as credible to construct the history of the early life of Sambhaji in their works.

The poet of the Paramanandakavya, who has written the portions related to Sambhaji tells us that the ministers of Chhatrapati Shivaji were "untruthful"; they were hostile towards Sambhaji; therefore, they put in the mind of queen Soyarabai the idea that after Shivaji, Sambhaji should not be allowed to succeed him on the throne of the Svarajya; due to it Queen Soyarabai instigated the mind of Shivaji, who, due to his partiality towards her, ill-treated Sambhaji, and therefore, Sambhaji deserted to the Mughals and with their help conquered Bhupalgad of the Svarajya.

All this, which is a fabricated story has been narrated by Sambhaji to cover his guilt against the Svarajya in his Danapatra of 24th August, 1680. Even though, as has been shown in the above analysis of that Danapatra, we find no credible historical proofs for it; it has found an echo in the Paramanandakavya, as its poet, who was under the obligations of Chhatrapati Sambhaji (because of his position of the court-poet in the Court of Sambhaji) has naturally

preferred to say in it, what his master, Sambhaji had stated about it earlier. It is clear from this that the Paramanandakavya cannot be regarded as an independent source for the history of Sambhaji. It tells us the very matters which Sambhaji has stated in the Dananatra he has issued earlier to the time of the composition of the Paramanandakavya.

Even though there exists from the point of view of scientific historical analysis the above mentioned weakness in the Paramanandakavya, it is an important credible source for obtaining the data about the early life of Sambhaji. For example, we learn from it that Yuvaraj Sambhaji had asked for his share (Bhaga) in the kingdom of Shivaji, before Shivaji went on his Karnataka expedition in October, 1676. The purport of this demand of Sambhaji is supported by the Bakhar of Shivaji written by Krishnaji Anant Sabhasad about the talk which Chhatrapati Shivaji had with Sambhaji after Sambhaji's return from the Mughal camp to the Svarajya.

The Paramanandakavya also gives us the information about the life which Sambhaji spent at Shringarpur, (a place where Shivaji had placed him before proceeding on the Karnataka expedition in October, 1676), the performance of the "Kalashabhishek" by Sambhaji; the company which he had of the persons of the Shakti cult there; the performance of a "Kuveda" (wicked scheme to enslave the

the ghosts) by the friends of Sambhaji, who belonged to that cult; the friendly relations which Sambhaji developed from that place with the Mughal general Dilerkhan, who was an avowed enemy of the Svarajya; the desertion of Sambhaji to the Mughals and in collusion with the Mughals and Sambhaji's conquest of the Bhupalgad of the Svarajya. All the information given of these matters in the Paramanandakavya is trustworthy as it is corroborated by the facts of those matters which we get in the contemporary Persian and English historical sources available for the history of Sambhaji.

We have used in our work, the Paramanandakavya which is edited by G.S. Sardesai.

(II) LATER SOURCES

(A) Kannada

(1) Keladiya Nripa Vijayam

Keladiya Nripavijayam is a historical work of Linganna Kavi. This work seems to have been composed approximately in 1770 A.D.[102]

The main purpose of this work is to narrate the biographies and achievements of the Kingdom of Keladi which existed during C.1500-1763 in the modern Shimoga district of Karnataka.[103] The Kingdom of Keladi is also known as the kingdom of Ikkeri.[104]

---

102. Keladiya Nripa Vijayam p.40; Basava Raja, K.R.V., History in Kannada Literature, (De Souza, J.P. and Kulkarni, C.M.,Ed., Historiography in Indian Languages, p.136), is of the view that it was composed between 1763-1804 A.D.
103. Desai, P.B.,(Ed.), History of Karnataka, p.411.
104. Keladiya Nripa Vijayam, Pp.44-45.

Linganna Kavi, while narrating the account of the rulers of Keladi family has paid more attention to give historical information about those rulers in his work. While relating the events of their reigns, he has also mentioned the dates of their occurrence.[105]

The Keladiya Nripa Vijayam is useful in supplying valuable and credible information to the historian about the relations which the kings of Keladi or Ikkeri had with the kingdom of Bijapur; with the rulers of Mysore, and with the different Nayaks of Karnataka.

Linganna Kavi has also narrated in the Keladiya Nripa Vijayam the information about the escape of Shivaji and Sambhaji from the prison of Agra;[106] and the influence of the Tantric cult on Chhatrapati Sambhaji.[107] This information of the Keladiya Nripa Vijayam is credible as it is corroborated by the details of other credible sources. But the information given by Kavi Linganna about the capture of Chhatrapati Sambhaji by the Mughals at Sangameshwar cannot be accepted as true since it is not supported by the other credible sources pertaining to the reign of Chhatrapati Sambhaji.

---

105. Ibid., p.40.

106. Ibid., Pp.61-62.

107. Ibid., p.64.

(B) Marathi

(1) Bhonsle and Peshva's Bakhar

This Bakhar does not seem to have been used by the historians of the Maratha period upto now.

About this Bakhar we are told that "This manuscript is a transcription of an original owned by one Bachoba Putnikar (Paithankar), a resident of Poona. It is stated that the clerks, Narayan Rao and Anand Rao, in the service of Col. Mackenzie, the Superintendent in the service of the Mysore Government, were responsible for transcribing the original manuscript. The name of the author of the original or his place of residence or his date and such other particulars are not provided. The record was said to have been transcribed on the 25th day of July 1870 while camping at Poona."[108]

This Bakhar gives an account of the events upto the death of Peshva Madhavrao I (1761-1772) and the immolation of his wife Ramabai on the funeral pyre of her husband. This probably would prove that the Bhonsle and Peshva's Bakhar was written in 1772.

Though this Bakhar has in it a disorderly account of the Chhatrapatis of the Maratha State and their Peshavas, it is instrumental in supplying credible information that

---

108. Bhonsle and Peshva's Bakhar, Ed. Chandrasekharan, T., Introduction, Pp.i-ii, Though the Editor has stated the year of the transcription of the Bakhar as 1870; in the text of it, the transcriptiors have given that year as 1807 (Ibid., p.68).

"Queen Soyarabai hanged herself to death and put an end to her life."

The information about the commission of suicide by Queen Soyarabai given in the Bhonsle and Peshva's Bakhar is trustworthy as it is corroborated by the contemporary English Records pertaining to the period of Chhatrapati Sambhaji. This helps us to set aside the charge which different historians have levelled against Sambhaji about the"putting to death queen Soyarabai when he became the Chhatrapati" on the basis of the Bakhar of Sambhaji written by Malhar Ramrao Chitnis.

(2) Malhar Ramrao Chitnis Virachit Shrimant Sambhaji Maharaj Ani Thorale Rajaram Maharaj Yanchi Charitren

It was during 1810-11 A.D. that Malhar Ramrao Chitnis, who was an hereditary high official in the court of Satara wrote the historical biographies of Chhatrapati Sambhaji and Rajaram. He had undertaken that task at the instance of Chhatrapati Shahu II (1777-1808) of Satara.[109]

Since the ancestors of Malhar Ramrao Chitnis were high officials in the service of the Chhatrapatis of Satara, he had in his possession important papers of different matters. Together with this, he was in the know of many details of different episodes and happenings which took place in the Svarajya at different times

---

109. Chitnis Bakhar of Sambhaji and Rajaram - Sane; Introduction, p.1.; Joshi, S.N., Prastavana, (BISMQ, XXX, Nos.1-2, Pp.12-15).

through the agency of the hereditary accounts which were prevailing of those episodes in his family. Those details he could know better than other people, as his ancestors were participants in or eye witnesses of those episodes or happenings. Malhar Ramrao Chitnis seems to have used all those papers and that knowledge to write the biographies of Chhatrapati Sambhaji and Rajaram.

The Bakhar of Sambhaji is important for the study of the life of Chhatrapati Sambhaji as it throws considerable light on the haughty, reckless and unstatesman like character of Sambhaji. It also gives meaningful information about the influence wielded by Kavi Kalash on Sambhaji and the adherance of Sambhaji to the Tantric cult. Chitnis, however, exaggerates and sometimes even presents some of the events in a perverted form. Yet, the impression created by this Bakhar about Sambhaji is confirmed by other contemporary sources.

The Bakhar of Chhatrapati Rajaram, the younger step-brother of Sambhaji, written by Chitnis also throws a helpful light on the personality and character of Rajaram and the calamitous circumstance in which the Svarajya was put during the reign of Sambhaji; and again when Sambhaji was captured alive by the Mughals. The Bakhar of Rajaram, is corraborated, in this respect, by the details available in the contemporary sources.

(3) Senapati Dabhade Va Gaikwad Yanchi Kakikat

The eminent historian of the Maratha period, K.N. Sane, has edited and brought to light the important historical information of the Dabhade and the Gaikwad families, who have played a notable role in the history of the Svarajya.

This account of the Dabhade and the Gaikwad families, reveals that after becoming the Chhatrapati of the Svarajya, Sambhaji had associated in the work of his military administration, his younger step-brother, prince Rajaram.

After the death of Chhatrapati Shivaji, his queen Soyarabai (mother of Rajaram) and his ministers like Annaji Datto, had performed the Manchakarohana ceremony of prince Rajaram by declaring him as the successor of Shivaji to the Svarajya in order to set aside the succession right of Sambhaji, who, earlier, had joined the Mughals. Sambhaji put down this plot in 1680 and after becoming the Chhatrapati of the Svarajya, treated queen Soyarabai, Annaji Datto and Prince Rajaram honourably and with due dignity. Still, Annaji Datto and others, implicating queen Soyarabai in their plot of joining hands with prince Akbar, the rebel son of Aurangzeb and to whom Sambhaji had given asylum in June, 1681, tried to bring Rajaram on the throne of Svarajya by dislodging Chhatrapati Sambhaji from it. Sambhaji, after the disclosure of this plot, sentenced Annaji Datto and other officials to death. In

that episode, to end her disgustful life queen Soyarabai committed suicide. In that unhappy atmosphere which was fraught with distrust, Chhatrapati Sambhaji, it is worthy of note, not only treated prince Rajaram, whom some of the ministers of Shivaji had earlier set-up as a rival to his throne, affectionately but also entrusted to him the responsible work of the supervision of the defence management of the important forts of the Svarajya before Sambhaji started his warfare with Aurangzeb. This data proves the affection and consideration of Chhatrapati Sambhaji towards his younger step-brother, prince Rajaram, who was an innocent boy of about 12 years at the time when two unsuccessful plots were hatched by Annaji Datto and others against Sambhaji.

(4) Shri Shivadigvijaya Athava Shri Shivaji Maharajanchi Bakhar

Though the editors of this Bakhar have stated that it is written by Khando Ballal Chitnis,[110] who had played an important role in the reigns of Chhatrapati Sambhaji, Rajaram and Shahu; Itihasacharya V.K. Rajwade is of the opinion that it is written on the basis of some unknown earlier Bakhar by an unknown member of the Chitnis family of Baroda.[111] Moreover it is written in 1818 A.D.[112] and not 37-38 years after the death of Chhatrapati Shivaji (that is, in 1717 or 1718 A.D.) as is contended by its editors.[113]

---

110. Shivadigvijaya Bakhar, Introduction, Pp.3-4.
111. Rajwade Khanda IV, Introduction, Pp.12-13.
112. Ibid.; Herwadekar, R.V., Marathi Bakhar, Pp.70-72.
113. Shivadigvijaya Bakhar, Introduction, p.3.

This Bakhar gives information about many matters of the life of Chhatrapati Shivaji in a disorderly manner. For example, in it the death of the wife of Shivaji, Saibai, the mother of Sambhaji, is shown at a time when Sambhaji had become a grown up boy. According to the credible historical data, Saibai's death took place when Sambhaji was a child of merely two years.

This Bakhar is however useful for the history of the early life of Sambhaji as it gives credible information about the desertion of Sambhaji to the Mughals and the anti-Svarajya activities which he conducted like the attacks on Bhupalgad with the help of Mughal army during his stay in the Mughal camp from 13th December, 1678 to 21st December, 1679. This historically true information is also found in the Shri Chhatrapati Sambhaji Maharajanche Danapatra of 24th August, 1680, and the Paramanandakavya,[114] a poetic Sanskrit work of the court poet of Sambhaji, which are authentic contemporary historical works and which are earlier to the Shivadigvijaya Bakhar.

(C) Persian

(1) Busatinussalatin of Muhammad Ibrahim Azzubairi.

The correct pronounciation of the work of Muhammad Ibrahim Azzubairi according to the rules of Persian grammar is " Basatinussalatin ", though in the popular usage it

---

114. Section III, Canto. 10-13, Pp. 80-102.

is called as " Busatinussalatin ".[115] It appears that this work was written in 1824 A.D.[116]

In his work, Muhammad Ibrahim Azzubairi has given the history of the eight kings who ruled Bijapur at different times, the history of the rulers of Bijapur upto Ibrahim Adilshah (1580-1627) and of nearly the half part of the reign of that ruler seems to have been written by the author on the basis of the Naurasnama or Gulshan-i-Ibrahim of Firishta and the Takjirtul-muluk of Mir Rafiuddin Shirazi. It appears that in the Busatinussalatin, the account of the reign of Muhammad Adilshah (1627-1656) is given on the basis of the Muhammad Nama of Mulla Jahur Walad Mulla Jahuri Kayana. The information of the reign of Ali Adil Shah II (1656-1672) seems to have been given by Azzubairi with the help of the Tarikh-i-Ali of Miya Nusrati and the Ali Nama of Muhammad Nusrat alias Nusrati. The history of the rest of the period of the kingdom of Bijapur upto the date of its extinction caused by emperor Aurangzeb (12th September, 1686) appears to have been narrated in the Busatinussalatin on the basis of Khafi Khan.[117]

Even though the Busatinussalatin is written at a much later date (1824) than the date of the extinction of the kingdom of Bijapur (12th September, 1686), scholars ascribe

---

115. Busatinussalatin - Khare, p.90.
116. Busatinussalatin - Parasnis - Bendre, Editor's Introduction, p. 13.
117. Busatinussalatin - Khare, Pp.90-91.

credence to the matters stated in it as those are narrated by the author on the authority of the contemporary historical works.[118]

The Busatinussalatin gives credible facts to reconstruct the political conflict in which the Bijapur kingdom was involved from time to time with Chhatrapati Shivaji, and the Mughal emperor Aurangzeb. Its historical data about the friendly relations which Chhatrapati Sambhaji had with the kingdom of Bijapur when he was involved in a mortal conflict with Aurangzeb is trustworthy, as it is supported by other contemporary Maratha and the Mughal sources.

But some other information given in the Busatinussalatin is not historically correct. For example, the author of the Busatinussalatin tells us that Shivaji wanted to kill or arrest Sambhaji, as Sambhaji was in love with the daughter of Shivaji's minister, and due to the fear of that action of Shivaji it was that Sambhaji deserted the Svarajya and went over to the Mughals. This contention of the author of the Busatinussalatin about the desertion of Sambhaji is disproved by the matters stated about that episode in the contemporary English Factory Records and the Bakhar of Shivaji written by Krishnaji Anant Sabhasad, mentioned already. Since both the English Factory Records and Sabhasad tell us that Sambhaji deserted to the Mughals due to his anger with

---

118. Busatinussalatin - Parasnis-Bendre, Editor's Introduction, p.13.

with Shivaji, no credence can be ascribed to the cause of that episode mentioned in the Busatinussalatin.

For the reconstruction of the history of Sambhaji we have used in our work the Marathi translation of the Busatinussalatin of G.H. Khare which relates to the reign of Shivaji. We have also used the Marathi translation of Busatinussalatin made by Narasinharao Vithal Parasnis and which is edited by Shri. V.S. Bendre under the caption Vijapurchi Adil Shahi in order to reconstruct the history of Chhatrapati Sambhaji.

(III) Miscellaneous Sources.

(A) Marathi

(1) Decisions from the Shahu and Peshva Daftar

In this work Shri. Vad, G.C., Mawjee, P.V., and Parasnis, D.B., have published some of the Watan-Patras, Nivad-Patras, etc., which were found by them in the Government records of the Alienation office, Poona.

Some of these documents are important for the history of Sambhaji as in them is found reliable data about the procedure followed during his reign to settle judicial disputes of the subjects in the Svarajya.

In its document No.18, which is a Nivad-Patra, we get credible information about the marriage of Sambhaji with Jiubai (Yesubai), the daughter of Pilajirao Shirke, who was an important Maratha noble in the area of Konkan. Similarly, that document is instrumental in giving us the credible data

about the marriage of Rajkuwarbai, the daughter of Shivaji, with Ganojirao, the son of Pilajirao Shirke; and the promise of Shivaji to Pilajirao that when a son would be born to Rajkuwarbai, he would be granting that son, the Deshmukhi Vatan of Dabhol. This helps us to know that Shivaji granted Vatans to selected people.

(2) Maharastretihasachi Sadhane. Volumes I and II.

In these volumes, their Editor, Shri. V.S. Bendre, has published historical documents which had earlier seen light in different Journals, monthlies, etc., many of which have ceased publication and whose earlier issues have become rare.

Some of the documents published in the volumes of the Maharashtretihasachi Sadhane are important for the history of Chhatrapati Sambhaji.

From those documents we get information about the influence of Kavi Kalash, the Chhandogamatya, in the administration of Chhatrapati Sambhaji; the friendly relations which Sambhaji had with the English; conversion made by Sambhaji to Hinduism of Gangadhar Ranganath Kulkarni, a Hindu, who was earlier converted to Islam by force by the Mughals; the continuation of the various Inams given to different persons by Shivaji by the administration of Sambhaji; the justice given by Sambhaji in the dispute of an hereditary Inam, etc.

All this information helps us to reconstruct the history of Chhatrapati Sambhaji.

(3) Marathyancha Itihasachi Sadhane

Itihasacharya V.K. Rajwade, who felt that "the original contemporary documents, or state papers proper were the only reliable materials of history"[119] and who held the view, "no document, no history", had collected, with an idea to write an authentic history of the Marathas, a vast number of historical documents from the descendants of the notable families which had played important role in the affairs of the Svarajya in the 17th, 18th and the 19th centuries A.D. Some of those documents, he published in the monumental 21 volumes of the above series. The other 4 volumes of that series were published after the death of Rajwade by the Rajwade Samshodhan Mandal, Dhulia (Maharashtra).

Out of those volumes, which were instrumental in starting an era of writing authentic history in Maharashtra, we have used in our work volume No. II,IV,VI,VIII,XV,XVI,XX, and XXI.

In these volumes, we also find the learned views expressed by V.K. Rajwade about scientific analysis of the historical literary works and documents pertaining to the history of the Svarajya.

These volumes contain historical documents which give credible information about the Treaty of Purandar which took place between the Mughals and Shivaji in 1665; the grant

---

119. Sarkar - House of Shivaji, p.282.

of the Deshmukhi Vatan of Paragana Masur by Chhatrapati Sambhaji to Mahadaji Jagdale; the resolve of Chhatrapati Rajaram to regard Prince Shahu, the eldest son of Chhatrapati Sambhaji as his (Sambhaji's) legitimate heir to the throne of the Svarajya; the deteriorating economic conditions which prevailed in the Svarajya due to the warfare of Chhatrapati Sambhaji against the Mughals; etc.

(4) Sanads and Letters

In this volume are published some of the historical documents of the Sanads and Letters of Chhatrapati Shivaji, Sambhaji and Rajaram, which became available from the Government Records in the Alienation Office, Poona.

These document supply data about the Jabata (Order) of Chhatrapati Shivaji in which he has stated the specific duties which his ministers and other officials were to perform; the Danapatra of Chhatrapati Shahu given to Ramchandrabhat Keshavbhat Pandit in which it is stated that Chhatrapati Sambhaji had listened to the recitation of the epic Ramayana from Keshav Pandit, his (Sambhaji's) Danadhyaksha; the Ajnapatra of Chhatrapati Sambhaji to Vitthal Shankar Deshadhikari, in which he has ordered Vitthal Shankar not to harass in any way Dattaji Keshav Pisal, the Deshmukh of Tarf Jarkhore, whom he had ordered to raise troops to fight against the Mughal troops which were in Konkan in 1684; and the order of Chhatrapati Sambhaji to his military officers and soldiers who had created trouble at the sacred

place Chinchavad in which he has asked them to stop their trouble at that place.

The information available in these documents throws considerable light upon the administrative, military and personal affairs of Chhatrapati Sambhaji.

(5) Selections from the Peshva Daftar. Vols.31,39,44.

Riyasatkar G.S. Sardesai has edited and published 45 volumes of Marathi historical letters in this series which is commonly known as the "Peshva Daftar"

These volumes of the Peshva Daftar contain historical letters which G.S. Sardesai has selected from the Records of the Bombay Government. Those volumes are a mine of valuable data for the history of the Maratha period upto 1818 A.D.

From the volumes of the Peshva Daftar which we have used in our work, we get information about the death of Rahuji Somnath, a trusted officer of Shivaji, in the prison of Chhatrapati Sambhaji; the capture of Chhatrapati Sambhaji by the Mughal troops at Navadi and not at Sangameshwar as was hitherto supposed; and the continuation of the Inam by Chhatrapati Sambhaji to Gadadhar Pralhad, which was earlier granted by Chhatrapati Shivaji.

The details stated above give proper knowledge about the administration of Chhatrapati Sambhaji and the circumstance in which he was captured alive by the Mughals.

(6) Tarabai Kalin Kagadpatre, Vols.I and II.

These volumes of historical documents are edited by Dr. A.G. Pawar.

The documents of Vol. I give information about the friendly relations which Chhatrapati Shivaji had with the Portuguese of Goa. As a result of that prosperous trade developed between the Maratha Kingdom and the Portuguese possessions of Goa.[120] During the reign of Chhatrapati Sambhaji, those friendly relations disappeared and the Portuguese supported the Desais of Maneri and Sankhali areas when they had rebelled against Sambhaji.[121]

The other documents published in Vol.I give information about Durgabai, the wife of Chhatrapati Sambhaji.

Document No.3 of Vol. I is the "Parashuram Charit" a historical poetic work. It was found ~~by~~ at St. George, Madras. Its composer appears to be a contemporary of Peshva Madhavrao I (1761-1772 A.D.).

Though this work is of a later period its information about the influence of sorcery on the mind of Sambhaji is supported by other sources like the Paramanandakavya.

Document No.3, published in Vol.II gives true historical information about the sacking of the territory of Konkan by large number of Mughal troops during the reign of Chhatrapati Sambhaji. Due to the attack of the Mughals, that territory

---

120. Ikk-I, No.208, p.278.

121. Ibid., No.36, p.57.

had suffered heavily. As a result, a large section of the population of that territory migrated to other parts of the Svarajya.

(B) Portuguese

The Svarajya which Chhatrapati Shivaji founded in 1674, had at different times trade and political relations with the Portuguese power of Goa. The Portuguese sources, though at present they are megre, in their translations in the English and the Marathi languages, throw a flood of light on the course of the Maratha-Portuguese relations during the reigns of Chhatrapati Shivaji and Chhatrapati Sambhaji. The English and Marathi translations of those sources in the form of extracts are found in the English and the Marathi books and articles which have been written by P.S. Pissurlencar on the Maratha - Portuguese relations. The following work having Portuguese sources translated into Marathi caters to a certain extent the need of historians of the period of Chhatrapati Sambhaji.

(1) Marathyanchya Itihasachi Sadhane - Portuguese Daftar - Khanda III, Asia Vibhag (Bhag 1 to 5) - 1663-1739 A.D.

A.B.D. Braganz Pareira, the Director of the Archieves of the Portuguese Government of Goa during 1939-40, has edited the Portuguese sources available in the Goa Archieves in several volumes in the Portuguese language.

Out of those volumes, Volume III, in which there exist the documents pertaining to the relations between the Portuguese Government of Goa and the rulers of the Maratha kingdom

from 1663-1739 A.D. have been translated into Marathi by S.S. Desai.

Of these Portuguese documents, we have taken into account in our work, the documents pertaining mainly to the period of Chhatrapati Sambhaji (1680-89).

We learn from a letter written by the Portuguese Viceroy of Goa in May, 1680, to Rayaji Pandit, a noble man under Sambhaji, that the Portuguese had responded well to the proposals of a Treaty of Peace and Friendship (between the Svarajya and the Portuguese Government of Goa) which were communicated to the Viceroy of Goa by Ramaji Thakur, the envoy of Sambhaji.[122]

The letters written by the Viceroy of Goa to Annaji Pandit (Annaji Datto) during the period 4th June, 1681, to 26th July, 1681, show that Annaji Pandit was an important person in the administration of Sambhaji.[123] This proves that Sambhaji had pardoned the offences of Annaji Datto of bringing on the throne of the Svarajya, prince Rajaram.

From the letter of the Viceroy of Goa written to (the king of) Portugal on 24th January, 1683,[124] we get the information that the Mughal army of emperor Aurangzeb, in order to crush Sambhaji and prince Akbar had entered in the Svarajya from three different sides.

---

122. Portuguese Daftar - Desai, Pp.23-24.

123. Ibid., Pp.28-30.

124. Ibid., Pp.33-34.

The same letter tells us that the Portuguese Government had given a passage through Goa to the Mughal army to attack the Svarajya.

From it we also learn that prince Akbar had sent his envoy to the Viceroy of Goa and had solicited his permission to effect the sale of precious ornaments in the territory of Goa. The Viceroy of Goa had granted that permission to prince Akbar.

In the similar manner, the letters written by the Viceroy of Goa to the king of Portugal at different times supply credible data to know properly the details of the warfare which Sambhaji had launched against the Portuguese in 1683 A.D. As a result of that war, the Portuguese kept on following a pro-Mughal policy upto the time of the execution of Sambhaji.

On the basis of the credible facts which we have gleaned from the above mentioned sources available in different languages, and the data which is available in the documents published in the Historical Journals like the Bharata Itihasa Samshodhana Mandal Quarterly, Bharatavarsha, Ramadasa Ani Ramadasi, Itihas Ani Aitihasik, etc., and the extracts of the Dutch Sources published in the Sivakalin-Patrasara-Sangraha Volumes; we have reconstructed the history of Chhatrapati Sambhaji (1657-1689).

Chapter III

EARLY LIFE OF SAMBHAJI

Sambhaji, the eldest son of Shivaji and his wife Saibai was born at fort Purandar on Thursday, May 14, 1657.[1] The birth of Sambhaji was an occasion of great joy and significance in the house of Shivaji for different reasons.

Firstly, the earlier three issues of Saibai and Shivaji, before the birth of Sambhaji were their daughters - Sakawarbai alias Sakhubai, Ranubai and Ambikabai.[2] In the society of that period, which considered a person having a son as fortunate, Shivaji naturally must have yearned for a son. Secondly, by 1657 A.D., Shivaji had emerged as a potential ruler in Maharashtra. As a result of his longing for independence and his giving up the desire of a loathsome life of servile luxury in the pay of some Muslim king,[3] Shivaji had secured a fond place in the heart of the people in Maharashtra. By bringing under his own authority the forts of Torna, Kondana (later Sinhagad) and Purandar, which belonged to the Bijapur state, Shivaji

---

1. Jedhe Shakavali, p.18; Shivapur Daftaratil Yadi, p.50, Shivapur Deshpande Vahitil Shakavali, p. 56. It appears that Chintamani was the name received by Sambhaji at birth (See Gosvami, R.P.,(Ed.), Sankarashana Sakalakalekrita Shivakavya, Sarga VII, Verses 1-15 Pp.17-18).
2. Oka, S.K., Shivaji Maharajanchi Kautumbik Mahiti, (Shivaji Nibandhavali I, Pp.324-325).
3. Sarkar, J., Shivaji and His Times, Pp.31-32.

had shown to his people that he was not a man of vain ideas of independence. His mission of liberating the people of Maharashtra from the yoke of the intolerant rule of the Bijapur Sultan became more apparent, when Shivaji audaciously attacked Chandra Rao More, the powerful Maratha noble of the Bijapur state and conquered the territory of his Jahagir, Javali. To continue that daring mission and the adventurous activity to fulfil it, Shivaji must have felt to have a heir.

Shivaji, therefore, celebrated the occasion of the birth of Sambhaji with great enthusiasm and he spent money lavishly on religious ceremonies and charity.[4]

Shivaji was a man of mission; he was aware of the great task he had undertaken. Naturally, he looked upon Sambhaji as a worthy successor, who was to continue the sacred mission. Therefore, Shivaji must have made all possible arrangements for the proper upbringing of Sambhaji even when he had launched himself on a stormy political career in Maharashtra.

Definite and full information about the education and training given by Shivaji to Sambhaji is not available in the extant historical sources. But from some of the facts available from them, it is possible to get a fairly good idea about the education and training given by Shivaji to Sambhaji.

---

4. Sabhasad, Shivaji Bakhar, p.6.

~~5. Jedhe Shakavali, p.19.~~

After the death of his mother, Saibai, on 5th September, 1659,[5] Sambhaji came under the direct care of Jijabai, the mother of Shivaji. Sambhaji grew under the fond care of this great lady and she must have imparted all the wisdom and idealism to her grandson. It goes without saying that she must have maintained her vigilant supervision of Sambhaji's training till her death in 1674.

As Sambhaji grew in years, Shivaji seems to have arranged for imparting instructions to him in the Sanskrit language and literature. He seems to have delegated that task of imparting instructions to Sambhaji to Keshav Pandit. Keshav Pandit who is the celebrated author of the Sanskrit works, Dandaniti Prakaranam and the Rajaram Charitam, seems to have been the family Purohita of Shivaji earlier to the period of 1670 A.D.[6]

Keshav Pandit alias Keshav Bhatta of Shringarpur, was an erudite scholar in the Nitishastra and Sanskrit language and literature. He seems to have deeper knowledge of the different forms of Sanskrit literature; Hindu Jurisprudence and the Puranas. He also seems to have made Sambhaji familiar with the famous works of different Sciences and Music written by ancient scholars in the Sanskrit language.

The instructions imparted by Keshav Pandit were instrumental in making Sambhaji reach a level of competency

---

5. Jedhe Shakavali, p. 19.
6. Bendre,V.S., Sambhaji, p.37.

in Sanskrit with which Sambhaji composed at Shringarpur sometime during 1676-1678, his famous work, the Budhabhushanam. Credence to the fact that Sambhaji owed much to the instructions given by Keshav Pandit is probably lent by the fact that on succeeding Shivaji as a Chhatrapati in 1680, Sambhaji elevated Keshav Pandit to the post of Panditrao-Danadhyaksha in his council of the Eight Ministers.[7]

It seems that like Keshav Pandit, one Umaji Pandit had also given instructions to Sambhaji when Sambhaji was staying at Shringarpur during 1676-1678 at the instance of Shivaji.[8] Though it is not known with certainty as to what instructions did Umaji Pandit impart to Sambhaji, it is felt likely that his instructions might have been in the Sanskrit language.

A more positive proof about the practice of the art of writing by Sambhaji in the Sanskrit language is made available through the agency of his Sanskrit Danapatra (a gift deed) which he has issued to a Mantrika (a person who practises charms or magic) and a priest who was the son of Namdev Bhatta Bakre of the sacred place, Parashuram (in Konkan) on 24th August 1680, after becoming the Chhatrapati.

This Danapatra bears two lines written in Sanskrit in Chhatrapati Sambhaji's own hand at the top.[9] In those lines

---

7. Ibid.,
8. Kotasthane, M.M., Shivajichi Bakhar, Kalam 59, p.41; Bendre-Ibid., p.67.
9. Potdar, D.V., Two Lines in Raja Sambhaji's Own Hand, (Pro.A.I.MHC, p.101).

it is stated that "what follows in writing (in the Danapatra) is approved by me, Shambhuraj Chhatrapati, the son of Shri Shivaji".

As a result of the competency of Sambhaji in the Sanskrit language, the scholars who have studied the original letters written during the time of his reign (1680-1689) feel that "he (Sambhaji) had kept up the habit of reading Sanskrit during his leisure hours till his advanced age".[10]

While providing for the facilities of giving education to Sambhaji, Shivaji must have also arranged for giving proper training to him in the matters of military and warfare. This training was a must in that age for a boy who was expected to become a capable leader of the people of Maharashtra in future.

It is not possible at present to know with certainty as to what sort of training and through whom it was that Shivaji gave to Sambhaji in the matters of the military and warfare. For, such an information is not available in the extant contemporary sources.

Some information about Sambhaji's training in those matters is given in the Bakhar of Shivaji written by Malhar Ramrao Chitnis, It is stated in it that Shivaji had arranged for Sambhaji's training in horse-riding, archery, use of arms and physical exercises.[11]

---

10. Velankar, H.D., Introduction,(Budhabhusan,p.XIII).
11. Chitnis - Shivaji Bakhar, Pp.174-176.

Though the contemporary and later sources do not shed much light on Sambhaji's training in the matters of the military and warfare, it is possible for us to know about it meaningfully by taking into account the daring activity of warfare and strategy which Sambhaji conducted against the Siddis of Janjira, the Portuguese of Goa and the Mughal emperor Aurangzeb of Delhi during 1680-1689. The skill of generalship and personal bravery which Sambhaji displayed during that time, leads us to infer that he must have received in his young age fine training in the use of arms and war strategy under the personal direction of Shivaji and the best of his commanders.

When the education and military training of Sambhaji was going on, events of great importance took place in the political life of Shivaji.

Out of those events, one was of the deadly encounter of Shivaji with Afzalkhan, a nobleman of Bijapur(who had undertaken a mission of either to capture or kill Shivaji), in which Shivaji became successful in November, 1659.

Sambhaji was always proud about the resolution and courage which Shivaji displayed in the critical encounter with Afzal Khan. For, Sambhaji has expressed in his Bakre Danapatra of 24th August 1680, admiration about the valour of his father in this episode.[12] (See Appendix - A)

Another event of great importance in the political life of Shivaji was his daring night attack on Shahistekhan. Shahistekhan was posted by Aurangzeb to the viceroyalty of the Deccan in July 1659. Shahistekhan, who was the maternal

---

12. Bakre Danapatra, p.433.

uncle of Aurangzeb and the grand noble of the Delhi court, was given a task to suppress Shivaji.[13] This was because since 1657, Shivaji was fighting against the Mughals along with Bijapur, and had conquered the territory of Konkan which was promised by Bijapur to the Mughals by a treaty of August, 1657, between Bijapur and the Mughals.[14]

After conquerring different towns in Maharashtra Shahistekhan occupied Poona in May, 1660. He then besieged the fort of Chakan in June 1660. It was to be free to deal with the Mughals that Shivaji escaped on 13th July, 1660, from Panhala which was besieged by the forces of Bijapur. Chakan fell in August, 1660, Shahistekhan then took permanent residence in the home of Shivaji's childhood at Poona. " To surprise the Khan here was a task that required no less agility and cunning than bravery and dash". As Shivaji possessed all these, he conducted a surprise attack on the well guarded residence of Shahiste-Khan in the mid-might of 5th April, 1663. With great daring and risking his own safety Shivaji with his trusted followers entered the harem of Shahistekhan and severed the thumb of the Khan with one stroke of his sword in the skirmish that followed between him and Shahistekhan."This night attack was a complete success. The daring and cunning of the Maratha hero (Shivaji) were rewarded by an immense

---

13. Sarkar, J., Shivaji and His Times, p.75.

14. Pagadi - Shivaji, Pp.82-84.

increase of his prestige. The whole country talked with astonishment and terror of the almost superhuman deed done by him."[15]

Sambhaji, who was a boy of six years of age during this time, must have been thrilled to see his father's rise to political ascendancy in Maharashtra because of his deeds of valour. He has made a fond reference to the episode of the attack of Shivaji on Shahistekhan while mentioning proudly about his lineage in his Danapatra.[16]

It seems that Shivaji wished to collect friends and supporters for his activity of establishing Svarajya in Maharashtra by strengthening his position by marriage relations in important Maratha families. His marriages with the girls of different important families in Maharashtra had taken place probably due to those considerations.[17] It is likely that keeping in view the nature of the future course of his political activity to found the Svarajya, Shivaji got his daughter Rajkuvarbai alias Nanibai, from Sagunabai, married to Ganoji Shirke the son of Pilajirao Shirke after 29th April, 1661, when he had conquered the territory of Konkan around Shringarpur.[18] Pilajirao Shirke was a powerful Deshmukh of Adil Shah of

---

15. Sarkar - Shivaji and His Times, Pp.88-91.
16. Bakre Danapatra, Pp.432-433.
17. Vaidya - Shivaji, p. 346.
18. Watan-Patras, Nivad-Patras, No.18, p.83; Bendre-Sambhaji, p.39; Oka,S.K., loc.cit.,p.225.

Bijapur in the Tal-Konkan (territory between Dabhol and Vengurla in South-Western Maharashtra); an area which was to be of great strategical importance in the future military history of Maharashtra. It appears, therefore, that to strengthen his ties with Pilajirao Shirke, Shivaji got married Sambhaji to Pilaji's daughter Jivubai probably in the end of 1664 or in the early month of 1665.[19]

Shivaji celebrated the marriage of Sambhaji with great pomp. He spent rupees four to five lakhs in its celebration and renamed Jivubai as Yesubai.[20] Yesubai was also known as Rajasbai.[21]

These matrimonial ties which Shivaji established with the Shirke family, helped him to bring under his hold, the Konkan area. That helped him to strengthen his activity of founding the Svarajya in 1674 in Maharashtra.

---

19. SGS Khanda III, 438, p.51, Oka,S.K. Loc.cit, p.210; places this marriage in Shake 1571, i.e. in 1669 A.D. This does not seem to be correct in view of the contents of the document in SCS Khanda III 438,p.51. It states that "after this marriage, reconciliation between Shivaji and Lakham Sawant was effected by Pilajirao". Lakham Sawant had made peace with Shivaji in 1664-1665 (SPSS-I,No.1041, p. 278). See also, Sarkar, J., Shivaji and His Times, p.227. In effecting that peace, Pilajirao seems to have helped Shivaji. However, Lakham Sawant went against Shivaji when Jai Singh undertook expedition against Shivaji (Sardesai, Shivaji, p.99).
20. Chitnis, Shivaji Bakhar, p.165.
21. Paramanandakavya, Section V, Conto 5, Verse 1,p.176.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ... LIBRARY

When Shivaji was busy in settling his matrimonial alliances with Pilajirao Shirke, Aurangzeb took steps to proceed against him in Maharashtra.

The failure of Shahistekhan in putting down the activities of Shivaji caused a bitter mortification to Aurangzeb. He got more irritated when Shivaji, with greater audacity, sacked the city of Surat, which was the richest port of Western coast of the Mughal empire, on 6th January, 1664.[22] Therefore, to deal firmly with Shivaji and to put an end to his attacks on the Mughal territory, Aurangzeb deputed Mirza Raja Jaisingh, who was the ablest Hindu commander of his court. Under his command Aurangzeb put his ablest Muslim generals like Dilirkhan and Daudkhan Qureshi. Jaisingh carried out his military campaigns to conquer the territory and the forts of Shivaji with such a skill that Shivaji had no alternative left before him than to sue peace with the Mughals.[23]

When Shivaji was settling the terms of the treaty of Purandar with the Mughals, Jaisingh treated him with severe curtness[24] in order to hurl insult at him. With shrewd statemenship and a cool-head, Shivaji keeping an eye on the fulfilment of his ideal dream of Svarajya in future, gulped the curtness of Jaisingh and accepted the

---

22. Jedhe Shakavali, p.22.
23. Sarkar, Shivaji and His Times, Pp.109-121; Chitnis-Shivaji Bakhar, p.144; states that the Portuguese and the Siddis had joined Jaisingh.
24. Sarkar, Shivaji and His Times, Pp.109-121.

Treaty of Purandar in June 1665.

According to the Treaty of Purandar, Shivaji surrendered his twenty three forts to the Mughals. He agreed to send his son, Sambhaji, as a Mansabdar of five thousand horse for regular attendance and service under the Emperor or the Mughal governor of the Deccan. Shivaji also agreed to accompany the imperial army in its expedition against Bijapur and help Jaisingh.[25]

The proposals of Shivaji to effect the Treaty of Purandar were accepted by Aurangzeb and he granted a Mansab of five thousand to Sambhaji.[26] This brought Sambhaji, who was then a boy of eight years, in the field of active politics.

As was agreed, to attend the work of his Mansab, Sambhaji was sent to the camp of Jaisingh by Shivaji on 17th June, 1665. Along with Jaisingh's officer, Ugrasen Kachhwaha, Sambhaji reached the camp of Jaisingh on June 18, 1665[27] and started living there as a Mughal Mansabdar. From the extant historical evidence it seems that Sambhaji was in the camp of Jaisingh at least upto 21st September, 1665.[28]

---

25. Sarkar, Dingal Letters, p.137.
26. Jedhe Shakavali, p. 23; Khafikhan-Khare, p.73; Sarkar - Shivaji and His Times, Pp.123-124; Massir-i-Alamgiri - Khare, p.93.
27. Sarkar - Shivaji and His Times, p.126.
28. SPSS-I, No.1036, Pp.298-299.

During the time of his stay in the camp of Jaisingh, Sambhaji must have come in the close contact of several Rajput commanders. In that camp, Sambhaji must have seen as to how those Rajput commanders were co-operating with the insolent, haughty and senselessly proud Mughal commanders like Diler Khan, to put down the activity of Shivaji of opposing the tyrannical Muslim rule.

When Sambhaji was watching the contrasting ways of the life of his illustrious father Shivaji and those of his adversaries who were the commanders of Aurangzeb, there seem to have taken place the negotiations of Jaisingh by which he pursuaded Shivaji to agree to visit the court of Aurangzeb at Agra,[29] probably because he had no alternative than to accept whatever Jaisingh suggested.

After he agreed with Jaisingh to visit Aurangzeb at Agra, Shivaji brought back Sambhaji from the camp of Jaisingh and made the arrangement of the administration of his forts and territories during the time of his absence from Maharashtra.[30] When that arrangement was completed, Shivaji along with Sambhaji started his journey from Maharashtra and reached Agra on 12th May,1666.[31]

As was instructed by Jaisingh, his son Ramsingh received Shivaji and Sambhaji at Agra and conducted them to the Diwan-i-Khas (Select Audience Hall) in the inner part of the Agra palace. There Shivaji was presented to the

---

29. SPSS-I, No.1085, Pp.298-299.
30. Sabhasad - Shivaji Bakhar, Pp.41-42; Sarkar, Shivaji and His Times, Pp.136-137.
31. Sarkar, Ibid., Pp.140-142.

Emperor (Aurangzeb) by the Assistant Paymaster - General Asad Khan. His gifts as well as his son's (Sambhaji's) offerings were placed before the Emperor. Aurangzeb spoke not one word of welcome or recognition in return, and Shivaji was led back from the throne and placed standing in the line of 5-hazari mansabdars, that is in the third row of nobles. The work of the darbar proceeded and Shivaji seemed to have been forgotten. This was not the kind of reception he had so long been picturing to himself and expecting as almost a certainty from his many conversations with Jaisingh.[32]

Seeing the cold reception given to him by Aurangzeb Shivaji felt/and insulted. His anger reached its height when he was directed to stand in the row of the 5-hazari mansabdars of Aurangzeb and he burst out at Ramsingh in the magnificient court of Aurangzeb, "You have seen, your father has seen and your Padishah has seen, what sort of man I am, and yet you have wilfully made me stand up so long. I cast off your mansab".[33] It seems that Shivaji was annoyed because a proper treatment was not given to him according to the manners of the Protocol. He was not shown honour even when he, as an ally of the Mughals, had taken part in the Bijapur campaign of Jaisingh, and had concluded a treaty with the Mughals. Therefore, when he

---

32. Ibid., p. 142.

33. Ibid., p. 143.

was not given a Khilat like others, his ego was hurt, and he showed his annoyance for the treatment he experienced in the court of Aurangzeb.

That made Aurangzeb send his nobles to pacify Shivaji, clothe him in a Khilat and lead him back to his presence. But Shivaji refused to wear the Khilat and said "I decline the Emperor's mansab; I will not be his servant".[34] When this was reported to Aurangzeb, he told Ramsingh to take Shivaji away with himself to his own residence and persuade him. Ramsingh then took Shivaji to his own residence. After seeing that Shivaji was not prepared to listen to his reasoning, he sent Shivaji to his own camp.

Since Shivaji had decided of not going to the presence of Aurangzeb again, he did not attend the court after the 12th May, 1665. However from the 13th May onwards, he kept on sending Sambhaji to the court along with Ramsingh. That afforded an opportunity to Sambhaji to observe the course of the political life of the Rajput and Muslim generals, statesmen and diplomats of the court of Aurangzeb. It seems that in his court, Aurangzeb treated Sambhaji with dignity. On the 13th May, 1665, when Sambhaji attended the court, Aurangzeb gave him one full robe (Sar-O-Pa), a jewelled daggar and a pearl necklace as inam.[35] On one of the occasions of Sambhaji's visit to Aurangzeb, he called upon Sambhaji to have a duel or a wrestling match

---

34. Sarkar - Dingal Letters, p.157.
35. Ibid., p. 158.

(possibly with another boy of his age). At that time Sambhaji strongly refused to obey the Emperor.[36] In general, whenever Sambhaji went to the Mughal Court at Agra, Aurangzeb treated him with due admiration.[37]

On the basis of the extant sources of that period it is not possible to know as to what were the feelings of Sambhaji towards Aurangzeb, because of whose treatment Shivaji had got enraged in the Mughal court. But under the circumstances, those must have been of hatred towards Aurangzeb.

Sambhaji must have got struck by the horror of the dangerous situation in which Shivaji was placed at Agra after his return from the Imperial Court on the 12th May, 1665. After that day, Aurangzeb posted strong guards around Shivaji's camp. As Aurangzeb suspected that Shivaji might flee away, he ordered Fulad Khan, the police chief to post his force around Shivaji's camp. This force was to be strengthened by a section of the artillery for purposes of watchfulness.[38] As the nobles like Raja Jaswantsingh of the Mughal court were making representations before Aurangzeb to punish Shivaji for his rude conduct, "Shivaji's life was literally hanging in the balance throughout the period of his detention in Agra."[39] Seeing that his

---

36. Sardesai, NHM-I, p.182; ~~Danapatra of Sambhaji, p.433.~~
37. ~~Danapatra of Sambhaji, p.433.~~ Bakre Danapatra, p.433.
38. Pagadi - Shivaji, p.169.
39. Ibid., Pp.166-169.

father was made to suffer like this, Sambhaji must have naturally developed a spirit of hatred towards the politics of the Mughals and the Rajputs of that period.

Even though in his detention at Agra, Shivaji experienced a helpless situation, " he was not a man to yield to dispair. Appeals to Aurangzeb's sense of justice and hopes of intervention by any minister having failed, Shivaji was now thrown entirely on his own resources. First of all, he made Ramsingh cancel the security bond that he had given to the Emperor for keeping Shivaji in his own custody. Then he sent home most of the officers and all the escort that he had brought with himself to Agra (7th June). Aurangzeb had no objection to it, as he would now have a fewer enemies to watch and his captive would be utterly friendless at the Mughal capital".[40]

It seems that when Aurangzeb's mind was in a state of indecision in the matter of putting Shivaji to death, " Shivaji realized that the evil (day) is near, and he escaped from Agra on 17th August, 1666, along with

---

40. Sarkar - Shivaji and His Times, p.147.

Sambhaji." [41]

After his thrilling escape from the clutches of Aurangzeb, the immediate problem which Shivaji was required to attend was about his and Sambhaji's reaching quickly and safely to Maharashtra. In that critical circumstance in which their capture by the spies and men of Aurangzeb was just possible at any moment, Shivaji decided that with the utmost of possible speed, he should return to Maharashtra and leave Sambhaji for the time being to the care of his trusted people in North India. He, therefore, left Sambhaji

---

41. Dingal Letters, p. 167, In his letter of the 18th August, 1666, Ballu Shah has reported from Agra to Kalyandas, diwan of Amber, that "This morning Shivaji was found to have fled away from Agra". This shows that Shivaji fled from Aurangzeb's prison on the 17th August, 1666, and its news was learnt by Ballu Shah on the morning of 18th August, 1666. It is not known with certainty as to how did Shivaji escape from Agra. The Dingal Letters, p. 168, and the Jedhe Shakavali, p. 123, state that Shivaji and Sambhaji escaped by crouching down in the baskets (of sweetmeats) which used to be sent out of Shivaji's camp. However, Bernier, Francois, Travels in the Mughal Empire, p.190, states that "Seva-Gieffected his escape in disguise under the favour of night." Pagadi - Shivaji, Pp.181-182, feels that "one need not suppose that Shivaji allowed himself to get into the basket. He was not a man to allow himself to be bottled up and rendered helpless. Sambhaji, a lad of nine must have been seated in the basket while Shivaji might have accompanied the bearers disguised as a servant".

to the care of Krishnajipant, Kashirao and Visajipant, the relatives of his Peshva Moropant Pingle at Mathura.[42] After that Shivaji speeded up his way to Maharashtra and reached the fortress of Rajgad on 20th November 1666.[43] To divert the attention of the Mughal pursuers who would have otherwise exerted much to capture Sambhaji, Shivaji spread a false rumour that "Sambhaji, who had accompanied him (to Agra) had died on the way(to Maharashtra)".[44] Shivaji then sent his men and letters to the persons at Mathura with whom Sambhaji was left by him.

---

42. Sabhasad - Shivaji Bakhar, p.51; Bendre - Jaisingh and Shivaji, Pp.158-160; has included the name of Kabkalas, in the names of the persons to whole care Shivaji had left Sambhaji at Mathura. This does not appear to be correct as Khafikhan - Khare,p. 89,states that Kabkalas was at that time at Allahabad and not at Mathura. However, since there is a reference to Kalash in the Rajasthani Letters (Sarkar, J. and Raghubir Sinh, Rajasthani Records - Shivaji's Visit to Aurangzib at Agra, Letter No.33, p.447, it is presumed that Kalash got acquainted with Sambhaji at Agra.

43. Jedhe Shakavali, Pp.23-24; Sarkar, House of Shivaji, p.170, on the basis of the Dingal Letters gives that date as 12th September, 1666. However, the date given by the Jedhe Shakavali is held as correct by Pagadi - Shivaji, Pp.182-186.

44. Dingal Letters, p.170.

Accordingly, Krishnajipant, Kashirao and Visajipant along with their families brought Sambhaji in the disguise of a Brahmana boy and declaring him to be their nephew, at Rajgad to Shivaji on 20th November,1666.[45] Shivaji celebrated the occasion of the return of Sambhaji with great joy and spending money lavishly in charity he rewarded lavishly the persons who had brought back Sambhaji safely from Mathura after facing several obstacles.[46]

The Agra-episode in the life of Shivaji must have proved to be of value from the instructive point of view to Sambhaji. Since he was with Shivaji in most of the dangerous moments of his life in that episode, Sambhaji could obtain a first hand knowledge about the idealism of life for which Shivaji stood in Maharashtra and the several difficulties he was combating successfully with a high degree of statesmanship, diplomacy and courage. Sambhaji also had an occasion to learn correctly the attitude and evil designs of the contemporary Rajput and Mughal statesmen towards the ideal which Shivaji was struggling to bring in the actualities of life in Maharashtra.

For three years after his return from Agra, Shivaji lived very quietly at home, and avoided giving any fresh provocation to Aurangzeb. "He wanted peace for a time to organize his Government, make a revenue settlement of his lands, repair and provision his forts, and consolidate and

---

45. Sabhasad, Shivaji Bakhar, p.53; Jedhe Shakavali,p.24; Chitnis - Shivaji Bakhar, Pp.162-163.

46. Sabhasad - Ibid.; Chitnis - Ibid; Rajwade Khanda VIII No.23, Pp.19-20.

and extend his power on the Western coast at the expense of Bijapur and the Siddis of Janjira".[47]

To secure that necessary peace, Shivaji offered to make his submission again to Aurangzeb, and agreed to send a contingent of four hundred soldiers with Sambhaji to fight under the Mughal banners. Aurangzeb accepted that offer and though he did not restore any of his forts, recognized Shivaji's title of Rajah. Thus a peace was made by Shivaji which lasted nearly upto January, 1670.[48]

As was stipulated in the terms of the agreement with emperor Aurangzeb, Shivaji sent Sambhaji to the court of Shahajada Muazzam, who was the Mughal Viceroy of Deccan at that time at Aurangabad. Sambhaji saw Shahajada Muazzam on 4th November, 1667. Sambhaji was made after that a Mansabdar of five thousand. Jahagirs were granted to him in the territory of Berar and elsewhere. Sambhaji, with half of his army stayed with Shahajada Muazzam and the remaining half of his army was sent to his Jahagir.

Sambhaji stayed in the camp of Shahajada Muazzam for few days.[49] He was allowed to go back to Shivaji when

---

47. Sarkar - Shivaji and His Times, p.162.
48. Ibid., Pp. 162-164.
49. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha-Pagadi, p.25; Sarkar-Shivaji and His Times, p.162, however, states that Sambhaji "interviewed the prince on 4th November, 1667 and was next day permitted to return home." We feel that in this matter the account given by Bhimsen, who was in contact with Shahajada Muazzam and Jaswantsingh during 1666-1670 (Tarikh-i-Dilkusha-Pagadi, Introduction, p.2) may be regarded as correct.

Shivaji pleaded that since Sambhaji was a small boy he may be allowed to return home and when Shivaji agreed to send Sambhaji back in the service of Shahajada when he would be a grown up person. In place of Sambhaji, Prataprao (Gujar) remained as his representative to serve the Mughals in the camp of Shahajada Muazzam.

The stay of Sambhaji in the Mughal camp at Aurangabad, even though it was of short duration, must have given him an opportunity to know from close quarters the evil designs of the Mughal and the Rajput commanders of Aurangzeb towards Shivaji, who was struggling to establish the Svarajya.

During the period of his peace with the Mughals upto January, 1670, Shivaji used his time to frame a set of wise regulations related to his civil and military administration. By those regulations, he laid down the foundations of his government broad and deep. He restored many of his forts to their former strength and developed the ports of his territory during that period.[50] At this time, since Sambhaji was with Shivaji, he had a good opportunity to watch and imbibe at least to a certain extent the wisdom, the inexhaustible energy and deep sense of patriotism of his great father. Meanwhile, Aurangzeb's different actions brought his peace with Shivaji to an end in 1670.

---

50. Shejwalkar, T.S., Agryachya Sutakenantar, (Shiva Chhatrapati, p.126).

Aurangzeb, ever suspicious of his sons, looked upon the friendship of Shahajada Muazzam with Shivaji as a possible menace to his throne, and he secretly planned to sieze Shivaji's general Prataprao (Gujar), Niraji Ravaji and Anandarao who were in the Mughal camp at Aurangabad as hostages. They escaped from that calamity simply because Shahajada Muazzam, who had learnt about that order before hand from his court agent at Delhi, revealed it to Niraji Ravaji and allowed them to escape before the reaching of Aurangzeb's order to his camp.[51]

Another ill-judged measure of Aurangzeb which led Shivaji to break his peace with the Mughals was the attachment made of a part of the Jahagir which was given to Sambhaji by Aurangzeb to recover the lakh of Rupees which he had advanced to Shivaji in 1666 for his journey to Aurangzeb's court at Agra.[52] The other probable reason for the rupture between Aurangzeb and Shivaji appears to be the order which Aurangzeb had passed for the demolition of all the Hindu temples in his empire in April, 1669.[53]

The fourth probable reason seems to be that when Shivaji laid siege to Janjira sometime in April, 1669, Aurangzeb, when

---

51. Sabhasad - Shivaji Bakhar, Pp.58-59; Shivapur Deshpande Vahitil Shakavali, Pp.61-62.
52. Tarikh-i-Dilkisha - Pagadi, p.25.
53. Jedhe Shakavali, p.24; Sardesai - Shivaji, p.138; Shejwalkar, Agryachya Sutakenantar (Shiva Chhatrapati, p.129).

appealed for help by the Siddi, asked Shivaji to lift up the siege.[54] As the ordering of Aurangzeb to Shivaji was not stipulated in the treaty of Purandar, Shivaji continued the siege of Janjira against the wishes of Aurangzeb. But it is possible that due to that order of Aurangzeb, Shivaji might have felt that Aurangzeb was not allowing him a scope.

Having seen the evil designs of Aurangzeb against him, Shivaji opened his offensive with great vigour against the Mughals, His soldiers looted Mughal territory and attacked several of his forts which he had ceded to Aurangzeb by the Treaty of Purandar in 1665. During February, 1670, to June, 1670, Shivaji with conspicuous success and rapidity conquered the forts of Kondana (Simhagad), Purandar, Lohagad, Rohida, Hindola, Karnala,[55] etc. from the Mughals , and looted Surat in October, 1670,[56]

In that thrilling atmosphere of victorious activity against the Mughals, Shivaji associated Sambhaji, who had

---

54. ERS-I, No. 171, p.134; Pagadi - Shivaji, p. 199.
55. Shivapur Daftaratil Yadi, p.52; Jedhe Shakavali,p.24; Massir-i-Alamgiri-Khare, p.96. Fort Hindola is in the hills of Kulaba near the village Waki (Sardesai - Shivaji Souvenir, p.94).
56. Sarkar - Shivaji and His Times, Pp.170-175; Jedhe Shakavali, p.25.

become a boy of nearly fourteen years in age in the work of his administration on 26th January, 1671.[57] To carry out the work of his writing, Sambhaji was given a clerk, Mahadaji Yamaji,[58]

Just as the troops of Shivaji conquered different forts from the Mughals, they also effected the conquests of the fortress of Panhala from Bijapur on 6th March, 1673. From strategical point of view it was a very important fort for the Svarajya to protect its Southern boundary from the enemies.

It seems that the participation of Sambhaji in the administration of Shivaji was well known to the English of Bombay. For, we learn that their Bombay Council had sent Mr. Thomas Niccolls to Shivaji to make a final demand of the damage caused by Shivaji to their

---

57. Shivapur Daftaratil Yadi, p.52.

58. Rajwade Khanda VIII, No.25, p.21. On the basis of Abbe Carre, Sequel to the History of Sevaji, (Sen - FBS, Pp.232-233), V.S. Bendre (Sambhaji, p.50) and Kamal Gokhale (Sambhaji, p.40) have stated that the Maratha troops against the Mughals were led by Sambhaji in Gujara-t and Cambay.

    As Sambhaji was a boy of only 13 years in age, and as the Maratha troops did not reach Cambay in 1671, the matter stated by Abbe Carre that Sambhaji took the Maratha troops to Gujarat and Cambay should be taken literally.

factories at Rajapur and Hubli and had told Niccolls that in case if he will not be able to see Shivaji, he should see his son (Sambhaji) or some prominent officer of Shivaji and settle the matter about the damages caused to the English factories.[59]

Accordingly, Niccolls reached Raigad and interviewed Sambhaji on 24th May, 1673, as Shivaji was away on a pilgrimage. Sambhaji inquired with him about the work which he had with Shivaji. Niccolls then explained to him the case of the English for the damages from Shivaji. After getting his mission known, Sambhaji told him that he was not able to do anything in that matter and hence Niccolls should wait for some days to see Shivaji himself. He told Niccolls that he would send a message about his coming to Shivaji so that he would be able to see Shivaji early. Thereupon Niccolls waited and saw Shivaji on 3rd June,1673.[60]

Shivaji had conquered many lands and had gathered much wealth by 1674. He also possessed a strong army like an independent king. Still he could not claim political equality with the kings in India. Therefore, Shivaji decided to perform his coronation ceremony.

---

59. SPSS-II, No.1535, Pp.437-439.

60. Ibid., No.1536, Pp.439-441; Sarkar - Shivaji and His Times, p.344; Sen ERS-I, No.358, Diary of Thomas Noccolls, Pp. 251-256.

The coronation ceremony of Shivaji took place, with great pomp and jubilation at Raigad on 6th June, 1674[61] and Shivaji declared himself as the Chhatrapati of his independent state - the Svarajya.

After the Coronation ceremony, when Shivaji had ascended the throne in the morning of 6th June, 1674, the English ambassador, Henry Oxinden, was brought by Nirajipant in the presence of Shivaji in the hall of coronation.

Henry Oxinden saw that Chhatrapati Shivaji who was sitting on a nicely decorated rich throne, was surrounded by his ministers. On an ascent under the throne were sitting Sambhaji Raje (the eldest son of Shivaji), Peshwa Morapant and a prominent Brahmin (Ganga Bhatta).[62] Soyarabai, (the wife of Shivaji, who was the mother of Rajaram (born on 24th February, 1670) the younger son of Shivaji and the step-mother of Sambhaji, who had become the Chief Queen of Chhatrapati Shivaji due to the Coronation ceremony,[63] does not seem to have been present in the hall of Coronation at that time.

By that Coronation ceremony, Chhatrapati Shivaji became a dejure sovereign of an independent state - the Svarajya - in the political map of India. To assert his

---

61. Shivaji and His Times, Pp.201-211; SPSS-II, No.1643, 488-490; No.1684, Pp.504-505.
62. SPSS-II, Ibid.; Sen-ERS-I, No.486, Oxinden's Narrative, Pp.369-376.
63. Chitnis - Shivaji Bakhar, p.220.

power, Chhatrapati Shivaji started his own Era - the Rajyabhisheka Shaka - from 6th June, 1674, which was followed in his Court and the state matters. He also issued his own coins.

That coronation ceremony also elevated Sambhaji in his position in the Svarajya. By that ceremony Sambhaji became the Yuvaraj (heir apparent) of Chhatrapati Shivaji. The subjects of the Svarajya, therefore, looked at him as the legitimate successor of Chhatrapati Shivaji to the throne of the Svarajya.

Within a fortnight of the coronation ceremony Jijabai, the beloved mother of Shivaji, who had inspired him constantly in his adventures, died on 17th June, 1674.[64] The sad demise of that great lady was attributed to some defect in the procedure in the coronation ceremony by Nischal Puri Goswami, a high Tantrik priest, who was present at the time of the coronation ceremony of Shivaji. Therefore, on the basis of the advice of Nischal Puri, the second coronation ceremony of Shivaji was performed according to tantrik methods, which involved puja and sacrifice on 24th September, 1674. Shivaji also accepted Nischal Puri as his guru and received the Rajarajeshwari Mantra from him.[65]

---

64. Shivapur Daftaratil Yadi, p.52.

65. Fafe, Y.G., Shri Shivaraj Rajyabhisheka-Kalpataru, (BISMQ XXXVI, Nos.1-4, p.77); Bendre - Shivaji-II, Pp.755-759; Sarkar-Shivaji and His Times, Pp.211-213; Bendre,V.S., Coronation of Shivaji the Great, p.53; Sardesai, NHM-I, Pp.224-225.

Sambhaji seems to have been deeply influenced by the above things, and himself became a follower of the Tantrik cult. This is clearly proved by his performance of the tantrik rites at Shringarpur in March, 1678, in order to gain his selfish ends, even at the cost of Shivaji's life.[66] This significant impact of the tantrik rites has been totally missed by many scholars.

After his second Coronation Ceremony, Chhatrapati Shivaji performed the thread ceremony of Sambhaji on 4th February, 1675,[67] which was an auspicious day after the Chaturmasa (four prohibitive months observed by the Hindus in which they do not perform certain ceremonies like the marriage, thread ceremony etc.), as that ceremony of Sambhaji had not taken place at the time of Shivaji's two Coronation ceremonies.[68] When it is clear that in all his matters Shivaji had treated Sambhaji as his successor and had during the time of his first Coronation given to him a place of a Yuvaraj (Heir apparent) in his court,[69] we are inclined to feel that due to some unknown casual reasons Shivaji did not perform the thread ceremony of Sambhaji

---

66. Paramanandakavya, Section I, Verse 62, p.73.
67. Jedhe Shakavali, p.27.
68. Shejwalkar, T.S. Paramanandaputrakrita 'Anupurana' Kavyachen Parikshana, (Shiva Chhatrapati, p.135); Bendre - Sambhaji, p.115.
69. Shejwalkar - Ibid.

earlier.[70] By performing the thread ceremony of Sambhaji, Shivaji got legalized Sambhaji's position of the Yuvaraj in his court and the Svarajya.

That Sambhaji was empowered to settle disputes including those of Vatans, is seen in the case of Janaki Thakar and her unscrupulous deputy Shankaraoji Bhovar. Sambhaji being misled by Yadav Namdev, gave a verdict which was obviously unjust. This was promptly corrected by Shivaji.[71]

Sambhaji also attended the cases of the disputing parties. From the document of the dispute between Gopal Sete and others we learn that justice was given to Gopal Sete and his rights of the work were granted to him[72] by the Officers of Shivaji. In that document it is stated that an amount of five Hons which he had presented to Sambhaji was sent to the treasury of fort Raigad. This shows that Sambhaji was present at the time when that dispute was settled.

Sambhaji, by way of his work in Chhatrapati Shivaji's administration saw to it that the officers of the government of the Svarajya carried out their duties properly and they did not collect money in excess from the subjects. Whenever the cases of the collection of money in excess by the officers were reported to him, he took steps to

---

70. Bendre - Sambhaji, p.115.
71. SPSS-II, No.1688, p.506; Joshi-Rajyakarbharacha Itihas, p.89.
72. Rajwade Khanda XVIII, No.57 of 13th March, 1675, p.80; Bendre - Sambhaji, p.58.

warn those officers.

This is proved by the two letters which Sambhaji had written to the officers of the Svarajya on 4th May,1675.

In his first letter addressed to Ragho Bhaskar, the Sar Havaldar and Karkun of Prant Pune, Sambhaji has stated that he learnt that Ragho Bhaskar had collected twenty five Hons as a Miras Patti even though it was not due to be collected from the Inam of Niloji Nilakantharao, Shankaraji Nilakantharao, Visaji Nilakantharao and Trimbak Nilakantharao at Chambali. Sambhaji, therefore, asked Ragho Bhaskar not to collect that Miras Patti from that Inam since previously no such charge was levied on it.[73]

The second letter has been written by Sambhaji to Ragho Ballal, the Subhedar of Junnar. In it he has communicated to him the contents of the above letter written by him to Ragho Bhaskar, the Sar Havaldar and Karkun of Prant Pune.

In his letter, Sambhaji has asked Ragho Ballal to write to Ragho Bhaskar and see to it that the Miras Patti is not collected by him from the Inam held at Chambali by Niloji Nilakantharao, Shankaraji Nilakantharao, Visaji Nilakantharao and Trimbak Nilakantharao. Sambhaji has clarified in his letter to Ragho Ballal that the Miras Patti was to be collected from the Mirasdars and not from the

---

73. SCS Khanda-III, No. 400, p.4.

Inamdars.[74]

The Miras Patti which is mentioned by Sambhaji in his above mentioned letters was a tax known as the Simhasana Patti (the Coronation tax) which was not to be collected from the people who held the Inams.[75]

Sambhaji also seems to have been present in the court of Chhatrapati Shivaji whenever important matters were transacted in it. This is proved by the narrative given by Samuel Austen, the English Envoy, who saw Chhatrapati Shivaji in his court on 6th September, 1675. When Samuel Austen was pleading his case before Shivaji to demand satisfaction for the damage done by the Maratha army to the English East India Company's factory at Dharangaon in Khandesh, he found that in his court Sambhaji was present along with the principle officers of Shivaji.[76] They all listened to the pleading of Samuel Austen. After his pleading, Chhatrapati Shivaji refused to pay damages to the company as he thought that the factory of Dharangaon was looted by "vagabonds and scouts without order or the knowledge of his general". Shivaji, however, "after a strict debate" gave his Kaul (Document of the assurance of safety) to all the English factories" to prevent like injuries."

---

74. Ibid., No.401, Pp.4-5.
75. Joshi - Rajyavarbharacha Itihas, Pp.88-89.
76. Sen - ERS-II, No.122, Samuel Austen's Narrative, Pp.69-71; Sarkar, Shivaji and His Times, p.348.

This incident shows that Sambhaji, who used to be present in the court of Chhatrapati Shivaji had been given opportunities by Shivaji to watch and study the affairs of the Maratha court which Shivaji used to transact with diplomacy and skill

When Sambhaji was being given opportunities by Chhatrapati Shivaji to shoulder responsibility in the administration of the Svarajya and to watch and study the execution of the work in the Court after his first Coronation ceremony (6th June, 1674), Chhatrapati Shivaji launched himself on a career of vigorous warfare.

It seems that Chhatrapati Shivaji had associated Sambhaji also in his activity of warfare during this time. For, we learn from Dr. John Frayer, an English Surgeon, who was in the service of the English East India Company in India during 1672-1681 and who has written an account of the conditions in India during that period, that the Maratha troops under Sambhaji went upto the border of Golkonda.[77] On way of his return to the Svarajya, Sambhaji set upon Hubli, Raibag and other mart towns and looted them.[78]

On 17th April, 1675, Chhatrapati Shivaji personally conquered the Bijapur fortress of Fonda and after conquering Shiveshwar and Ankole in Karwar he brought under his

---

77. Frayer - Travel Account-II, p.44, states that Sambhaji went upto Bhaganagar, the capital of Golkonda. This does not appear to be probable.
78. Ibid.

control the sea-shore upto Ankole.[79]

Chhatrapati Shivaji effected these conquests of the territories of the Bijapur kingdom with great tact and diplomacy. Before opening hostility against the Bijapur kingdom, Chhatrapati Shivaji isolated it from the Mughals by opening delusive peace negotiations with the Mughals through Bahadurkhan, the Mughal Viceroy in the Deccan, during March-May 1675. According to these negotiations "it was proposed that Shivaji should cede 17 of his forts to Aurangzeb and send his son Sambhaji with a contingent to serve under the Mughal Subhedar, while the Emperor would create Sambhaji a commander of 6 thousand horse, and grant Shivaji all the country on the right bank of the Bhima. The negotiations were deliberately spun out. Shivaji demurred to sending his son to the Mughal general until he had better security for his safety. Bahadurkhan, (the Mughal Viceroy of the Deccan) reported the terms to the Emperor, who sent in reply a farman accepting them and pardoning Shivaji's past misdeeds. Then the viceroy

---

79. Jedhe Shakavali, p.27; Kale-Shivaji, Pp.198-199. Fonda is on the Kolhapur-Devgad Road. It is different from the Portuguese town Ponda which is near Panaji in Goa (Sardesai-Shivaji, F.N.2, p.169). Fonda is 22 miles from Panaji(Goa). In Sardesai-Shivaji Souvenir p.80; Fonda is said to be in Savantwadi. This is different than the one stated above.

sent messengers to Shivaji to receive the farman and deliver the forts.[80] As by this time (July 1675), the objective of Shivaji of the capture of Fonda was achieved, Shivaji threw off the mask of those negotiations and dismissed the Mughal envoys with taunts.[81]

Yuvaraj Sambhaji, who was closely associated with the Court and administration of Chhatrapati Shivaji had a good chance to study properly the diplomacy and the tact with which Shivaji handled his enemies during this time.

Bahadurkhan, the Mughal Viceroy of the Deccan, felt ashamed when he was outwitted by Chhatrapati Shivaji. To cover his foolish credulity and diplomatic defeat by some striking success, he hurriedly made an agreement with Khawaskhan, the Vazir of Bijapur, in October, 1675, for a joint war of the Mughals and Bijapur against Chhatrapati Shivaji.[82] Aurangzeb approved the move of Bahadurkhan against Chhatrapati Shivaji and gave up one year's tribute from Bijapur as it had now joined hands with the Mughals against the Marathas.[83] But this pact between the Mughals and the Bijapur kingdom did not last long. This was because Bahalolkhan, a

---

80. Busatinussalatin-Parasnis-Bendre, Pp.497-498. Sen-ERS-II,No.63,p.34, No.72,Pp.37-38; No.110,Pp.62-64; Sarkar-Aurangzib IV, Pp.211-212.
81. Sarkar - Ibid.
82. Busatinussalatin-Parasnis-Bendre,Pp.498-499.
83. Sarkar-Aurangzib IV, p.212.

powerful Pathan noble of the Bijapur court arrested Khawaskhan on 11th November, 1675, and himself became the Vazir of the kingdom of Bijapur.[84] After usurping from Khawaskhan the regency of the boy-king of Bijapur, Sikandar Adilshah, Bahalolkhan put Khawaskhan to death in January 1676[85] and established the Pathan domination in the Bijapur Court.

Meanwhile, on 11th November, 1675, the Maratha troops conquered the fort of Satara.[86] When Chhatrapati Shivaji went there personally to settle the defence and other arrangements of that fort, he became seriously ill during December, 1675, and January, 1676.[87]

We learn from the English Factory news of 17th January, 1676, that Chhatrapati Shivaji had become ill because "he was poisoned by his son (Sambhaji)".[88] The same source tells us that Sambhaji poisoned Shivaji because Sambhaji who had "debouched the daughter of one of the chiefest Brahmins of Shivaji, was ordered to be thrown down over the wall of the fort Raigad, if Sambhaji left

---

84. Jedhe Shakavali, p.27; Busatinussalatin-Parasnis-Bendre, Pp.500-501.
85. Sen-ERS-II, No.137, p.77; Kale-Shivaji, p.202.
86. Jedhe Shakavali, p.27.
87. Sen-ERS-II, No.137.p.77; Kale-Shivaji, p.202.
88. Sen-Ibid., No.139, p.78.

not going out at nights after the watch was set at Raigad to meet that girl."

Since the later news of 7th April, 1676, from the English Records contend that Chhatrapati Shivaji was "poisoned by his barber,"[89] it can be said that Sambhaji had not poisoned Shivaji. Though V.S. Bendre[90] accepts this English evidence, he has not stated anything in his work about the relations of debauchery of Sambhaji with the daughter of one of the "chiefest Brahmins" which are hinted in the English news of 17th January, 1676. Shri. Bendre has given an incorrect version of the words "Chiefest Brahmins" as the "chief minister" of Shivaji.[91]

Kamal Gokhale has not satisfactorily analysed this English news of 17th January, 1676, in her work. She seems to contend from that news that it was Queen Soyarabai, the wife of Shivaji and the step-mother of Sambhaji who might have poisoned Shivaji.[92] She has based her contention on the basis of the Shivadigvijaya Bakhar which says that Shivaji was poisoned by Soyarabai and that is why he died.[93]

---

89. Sen-ERS-II, No.152, Pp.84-85.
90. Sambhaji, Pp.116-117.
91. Ibid., p.116.
92. Gokhale - Sambhaji, p.56.
93. Shri Shivadigvijaya Bakhar, Pp.462-463.

The hollowness of that argument gets proved by the fact that in the English news we do not get at all even the casual mention of Queen Soyarabai. Secondly whereas the English news about the poisoning of Shivaji is of 17th January, 1676; she has connected it with the event of Shivaji's death on 3rd April, 1680, which is narrated in a fictitious manner in the Shivadigvijaya Bakhar. This connection of the earlier event with the later event is tantamount to the historical analysis unless there is established a sequential connection of the conduct of Queen Soyarabai to cause the death of Shivaji from 1676 to 1680. There is no credible historical data to prove that type of conduct of Soyarabai. In fact, the entire circumstance which developed in the Svarajya after the return of Sambhaji who had deserted to the Mughals in December, 1678, shows that it was not to the advantage of Queen Soyarabai to cause the death of Shivaji, who alone could protect her and her son Rajaram and the Svarajya from the evil actions of Sambhaji.[94] Therefore, the surmise of Kamal Gokhale that Soyarabai poisoned Shivaji in December, 1675 - January, 1676, cannot be accepted as correct.

About the relations of debauchery of Sambhaji with "the daughter of one of the chiefest Brahmins of Shivaji", which are hinted in the English news, Kamal Gokhale has expressed the view that Soyarabai must have spread those

---

94. Joshi, P.S. - Yuvaraj Sambhaji Ani Mogal-Eka Kuta Prashna, (BISMQ LI,p.88).

rumours.[95] For her surmise as she has not given any credible historical data to say that Soyarabai must have spread those rumours about Sambhaji, we cannot accept her contention to that effect.

T.S. Shejwalkar feels that in that English news a charge of the conduct of debauchery, against Sambhaji is made in such a definite manner that about it one cannot have any doubt.[96]

We are inclined to agree with the opinion of T.S. Shejwalkar. This is because we feel that after the second coronation ceremony of Shivaji (24th September, 1674) Sambhaji must have come gradually in contact with the persons versed in the Mantra-Tantras, and gradually, must have, by December, 1675, come under the influence of the person of the Shakti cult whose centre of activity in the Svarajya existed at Shringarpur. Support to this inference is lent by the fact that when in October, 1676, Shivaji had shifted Sambhaji at Shringarpur before going on the Karnataka expedition, Sambhaji became victim of the persons and the practices of that cult. Those persons not only performed the Kalashabhisheka of Sambhaji and declared him as Svayampurna (independent) but also performed a kuveda (wicked scheme to enslave the ghosts) with a wish that Chhatrapati Shivaji should die early

---

95. Gokhale - Sambhaji, p.56.
96. Shejwalkar,T.S.,-Shivaji-Sambhaji Sambhandha (Shiva Chhatrapati, Pp.142-143).

and then Sambhaji should become a king without any abstraction.[97] We feel that Sambhaji must not have undertaken such irrational and ill-conceived actions at Shringarpur unless he must have gradually come under the influence of those ideas. We are inclined to feel that the starting point of Sambhaji's coming under the influence of those ideas is the occasion of the second Coronation ceremony of Shivaji (24th September, 1674). Though T.S. Shijwalkar has not given in his work this point of Sambhaji's coming under the influence of the Shakti cult, he has stated that "during the time of his stay at Shringarpur, Sambhaji became a blind believer by larger degrees in the matters of the Shakti cult and sorcery and exerted with their help to become successful in realizing his political aspirations"[98] of having his share in the Svarajya in the life-time of Chhatrapati Shivaji itself.[99]

It becomes clear then that if we take into account the practices of the Shakti cult and its spread in Maharashtra we will get the clue to know as to why the English news of 17th January, 1675, has in it the mention of the deboucherous relations of Sambhaji with "the

---

97. Paramanandakavya, Verses 61-68, Pp.9-10; Bendre-Sambhaji,Pp.68-69; Shejwalkar,T.S.,-Shivaji-Sambhaji Sambandha,(Shiva Chhatrapati, p.145).
98. Shejwalkar, Ibid., Pp.146-147.
99. Paramanandakavya, Verses 78-79, p.65.

daughter of one of the chiefest Brahmins of Shivaji".

The Shakti cult or Tantrikism was an import from Bengal into Maharashtra in the time of Shivaji.[100] A Chitpavana Brahman named Shiva Yogi, on hearing the miracles wrought by Siddha-Yogi, a learned saint in "the city of Radha" in West Bengal, went there and after a long noviciate in austerities under him was ordained as a Tantrik monk. On returning to his home in Konkan, he set up his hermitage (matha) at Shringarpur (some ten miles north-east of Sangameshwar), and the fame of his spiritual powers spread far and wide. Two other Tantrik priests, Ganesh Anant Jambhekar and Keshav Upadhyaya (both Karhada Brahmans) also resided there, and thus the place became a centre of Tantrik propaganda in Maharashtra.

"The Tantra was not Black Magic or mere hocus pocus. It produced a vast philosophy and literature in Sanskrit, as learned and subtle as the Shaiva and Vaishnava theologies of Madras. And its object was not primarily sensual gratification. The aim of Tantra is to acquire perfect control over one's own body and mind, and then make the spirits of the invisible world one's slaves, by the practice of austerities and elaborate mystical rites.

---

100. Sarkar,J., - Foreword, (Paramanandakavya),p.5, Shejwalkar, T.S., Shivaji-Sambhaji Sambandha (Shiva Chhatrapati, Pp.145-146).

After attaining to perfection in this way, the master may employ his supernatural power in sensual gratification, the cure of hopeless diseases, or ensuring the birth of sons to barren house-holders, or even forging arms which make the devotee invincible in war. Its ultimate aim, however, was nirvana or perfect salvation. Bewitching other people (especially women) and transmuting baser metals into gold (or, what came to the thing, discovering buried treasure guarded by Yakshas) were the subsidiary fruits of Tantrik worship, though these were most emphasised by selfish low-class priests for easy success in propaganda."[101]

More elaborate information about the Tantrik rites is given to us by A.L. Basham. He tells us that "the tantric rites involved the breaking of all the usual taboos of Hinduism. Small groups of initiates met at night, often in a temple or private house, but also frequently in a burning-ground, among the bones of the dead. The group formed a circle, seated around the circumference of a large circular magical diagram (yantra, mandala) drawn on the ground. Though the members of the circle might include Brahmans and outcastes, there was no class distinction at the ceremony-all were equal, and no ritual pollution occurred from their contact.

---

101. Sarkar, J., Ibid.

After regular evening worship, the propitation of ghosts, and other rites, the group would indulge in the five MS (Pancha makara), madya (alcoholic drink) mamsa (meat), matsya (fish), mudra (symbolical hand gestures, known in other branches of Indian religion and in dance and drama, also sometimes taken in this context as roasted grain), and maithuna (sexual intercourse). The rites concluded with the worship of the five elements, to which the five Ms mysteriously corresponded. Among some tantric groups the last of the five Ms involved promiscuous copulation, while the members of others brought their wives to the circle. With yet other groups those rites which were reprehensible to orthodoxy were performed only symbolically".[102]

It is clear from the above stated things of the Shakti cult that there existed in it the persons who solicited nirvana (moksha) through its practices as well as others who tried to obtain subsidiary fruits of Tantrik worship (bewitching other people - especially women - and transmuting baser metals in to gold, etc.).

Since during the time of his stay at Shringarpur (October, 1676, to December, 1678) Sambhaji performed,

---

102. Basham, A.L., The Wonder that was India, (Fontana Books in association with Rupa & Co., Calcutta, 1967), p.240; See also Ghosh, A.B., The Spirit and Culture of the Tantras, (The Cultural Heritage of India - Vol.IV - The Religions, Ed., Bhattacharya, H., Pp.247-248).

with the help of the persons of the Shakti cult, his "kalashabhisheka" and "proclaimed himself as independent", and those persons also performed the "kuveda", a wicked scheme to enslave the ghosts with the desire that Chhatrapati Shivaji should die early; it appears that after the second Coronation ceremony of Shivaji (24th September, 1674) Sambhaji had come under the influence of the persons of the Shakti cult who followed the practices of acquiring the subsidiary fruits of Tantrik worship (bewitching other people-especially women-transmuting baser metals into gold, etc.) which were emphasised by selfish low-class priests of that cult.

As the persons of the Shakti cult and the Tantrik worship followed its practices of the Pancha Makaras and Sambhaji seems to have been in their company, the people of Maharashtra who abhorred those practices might have thought during that time that Sambhaji also must be following those practices; and because they might have talked on those lines, the agents of the English might have given the news that Sambhaji was living a life of debauchery in their news reports. There is no direct or positive historical evidence available to show that Sambhaji was a debauchee. It is also significant in this connection that Chhatrapati Shivaji, after hearing whose death news even Emperor Aurangzeb is mentioned to have

said in his court by the Portuguese envoy that "he was a great man who protected the honour of the captured enemy (Muslim) women",[103] took the step of only prohibiting Sambhaji from going out of the Raigad fort in the night. Had he found that Sambhaji was a debauchee, we feel that Shivaji would have dealt with him very severely as he himself was a man of high character and dignity. This in one way goes on to prove that during the earlier time to the English news (17th January, 1676) Sambhaji might have been in the company of the Brahmanas and other adherents of the Shakti cult and was not actually living a life of debauchery.

In June, 1676, Chhatrapati Shivaji, who was an enlightened Hindu ruler, undertook a bold step and converted to Hinduism, Netaji Palkar, who had some 10 years earlier deserted to the Mughals from Shivaji and had embraced Islam.[104]

The conversion of Netaji Palkar to Hinduism by Chhatrapati Shivaji proves that the atmosphere in the house of Shivaji was of progressive and liberal views. That seems to have exercised influence on the mind of Yuvaraj Sambhaji, who, after becoming the Chhatrapati, continued the activity of converting his subjects to Hinduism who had earlier by force were made converts to Islam.

---

103. Portuguese Daftar - Desai, p.2.
104. SPSS-II,No.1863, p.550; Kale-Shivaji, p.204.

After that Shivaji tried to reduce the territory of South Konkan. From the Dutch records,[105] it appears that Sambhaji might have led Maratha contingents during Shivaji's campaign in South Konkan.

When Chhatrapati Shivaji was carrying out these matters, his mind seems to have been engrossed in the political developments which had taken place in Karnataka in 1675. Shivaji's step-brother, Vyankoji, had succeeded to Shahaji's Jahagir in Karnataka*after Shahaji's death (January,1664). In 1674, Vijayaraghav Nayak, the king of Tanjore, died in his conflict with the Nayak of Madura, who was supported by the king of Bijapur and Vyankoji. Khawaskhan, the Vazir of Bijapur, then asked Vyankoji, who was in the service of Bijapur, to make the grandson of Vijayaraghav Nayak,who had survived in that conflict, the king of Tanjore. But Vyankoji, as a nobleman of Bijapur, himself usurped the kingdom of Tanjore in 1676 and crowned himself as the Maharaja on 5th March, 1676.[106] After that he left Bangalore and made Tanjore as his capital.[107] As by that time, Khawaskhan, the Vazir of Bijapur was arrested and put to death by Bahalolkhan, the Pathan noble of Bijapur, who had established the Pathan domination in court of Bijapur,

---

105. SPSS-II Ibid., No.1882, p.555; Pagadi-Shivaji, p.258.

*The territory held by Shahaji and Vyankoji was considerable. Bangalore, Kolar, Hoskote, Chikka Bellapur, Dodda Bellapur, Siva, Chikkanayakanhalli and Kanakgiri were in the possession of Shahaji. One third of the province of Jinji in Tamilnad was also held by Vyankoji (See - Pagadi-Shivaji, p.268).

106. Pagadi - Shivaji, p.269.

107. Muddachari - Mysore - Maratha Relations, p.69.

the Bijapur court could not do anything to displace Vyankoji from Tanjore.

It is held by the scholars[108] that the shifting of the capital from Bangalore to Tanjore by Vyankoji weakened the Maratha hold in the Mysore region as at that time. Under its ruler, Chikkadevaraja, Mysore was trying to free itself from the control of Bijapur and was expanding its territories at the expense of the Jahagir held by Vyankoji. Chhatrapati Shivaji did not want that the Maratha influence should disappear from the south due to the neglience of Vyankoji.[109] Therefore, when Nasir Muhammad, the Bijapur governor of Jinji and the brother of the murdered prime minister Khawaskhan of Bijapur, offered to cede Jinji to Kutub Shah, the King of Golkonda, as he was put to extremities by Sherkhan (the Bijapur governor of Walgondapuram and an adherent of Bahalolkhan); and Kutub Shah, at the instance of his minister, Madanna, in order not to excite the jealousy of the Mughals, negotiated with Shivaji the conquest of that territory with all the help of Golkonda on the condition that he would deliver all his conquests to Kutub Shah, Shivaji readily accepted that proposal.[110]

---

108. Pagadi - Shivaji, Pp.268-273; Muddachari - Ibid.
109. Pagadi - Ibid., p. 273.
110. Pagadi - Ibid., p.270.

About the motivation of Chhatrapati Shivaji to undertake the Karnataka expedition in October, 1676, we get a different type of information in the Paramanandakavya. In its poet has stated that Queen Soyarabai, the step-mother of Yuvaraj Sambhaji, felt that after Shivaji, her son Rajaram should become the king and Sambhaji should not succeed to the throne of Shivaji. Shivaji, who loved her much, agreed to fulfil her wishes.[111] He then told Sambhaji that he will not give any portion of his kingdom in Maharashtra (Svarajya) to Rajaram (means he will give it to Sambhaji). For Rajaram, Shivaji said, that he would conquer another dominion; so that his both the sons would enjoy separate kingdoms. Then Shivaji set out on his Karnataka expedition[112] (that is, to conquer territory in Karnataka for Rajaram and there-by solve the problem which had emerged in his house.).

Kamal Gokhale[113] has accepted as true what the poet of the Paramanandakavya has stated about the talk of Queen Soyarabai with Shivaji and has thereby tried to state that because he wanted to conquer another kingdom for his sons, he undertook the Karnataka expedition.

---

111. Paramanandakavya, Section III, Canto 6, Verses 1-52, Pp.56-60.
112. Ibid., Section III, Canto VII, Verses 1-109, Pp.60-68. Canto VIII, Verse 1, p.68.
113. Sambhaji, Pp.54-55.

Kamal Gokhale, has accepted as true the version given by the poet of the Paramanandakavya because she has not subjected it to the scientific historical scrutiny. When we put it to scientific historical scrutiny we find that there is no credible proof available in the extant historical sources to show that Queen Soyarabai was against Sambhaji in any way before his desertion to the Mughals (13th December, 1678). That she was against him earlier to his desertion to the Mughals is stated by Sambhaji in his Bakre Danapatra of 24th August, 1680, in order to cover his guilt of deserting the Svarajya and then to attack it with the help of the mughals during 13th December, 1676, to January, 1680. Since motivations of serving self interests can be ascribed to what Sambhaji has stated in the Bakre Danapatra, what evil matters he has stated in it about Queen Soyarabai and the ministers of Shivaji cannot be accepted as credible in the historical analysis unless these matters are supported by an independent and impartial credible historical source.

The matters about the antagonism of Queen Soyarabai and the ministers of Shivaji, which Sambhaji has stated in his Bakre Danapatra are voiced out by the Court Poet of Chhatrapati Sambhaji in the Paramanandakavya (whose period of composition is later to the date of the Bakre Danapatra) because he being under the obligations of his master, he had to say in his work the matters which his master had said for the justification of his desertion to the Mughals and

subsequently of his attacks on the Svarajya. Due to this, the nature of the Paramanandakavya in the history of Sambhaji is that of a biased and not of an impartial and independent credible source. Therefore, in the historical analysis, we cannot accept the matters stated in the Paramanandakavya as the ones which impartially support the matters which have been stated by Sambhaji in the Bakre Danapatra. In this matter the Paramanandakavya is nothing but a copy of the Bakre Danapatra.

The other source with the help of which Kamal Gokhale has tried to support the writing of Sambhaji in the Bakre Danapatra about the antagonism of Queen Soyarabai with him prior to his desertion to the Mughals and which has found expression in the Paramanandakavya is the Shivadigvijaya Bakhar.[114]

This Bakhar is written in 1818 A.D. and in it in an absurd and fictitious manner the death of Shivaji is ascribed to the witch-craft practised by Queen Soyarabai. No credence can be ascribed to its contents related to the matters of Soyarabai when we take into account the fact that there was no one other than Chhatrapati Shivaji to protect her and her son Rajaram from the evil actions of Sambhaji when after his desertion to the Mughals he returned to the Svarajya in

---

114. Ibid., Pp.51-52, 55.

January, 1680.[115] This Bakhar is written by the author on the basis of the earlier historical material.[116] Therefore, it appears that in it the material of the antagonism of Soyarabai with Sambhaji prior to his desertion to the Mughals and about his attack on the Bhupalgad with the help of Mughal army after his desertion seems to have found place as a result of the acquaintance of the author with the contents of the Bakre Danapatra of Sambhaji and the Paramanandakavya written by the Court Poet of Sambhaji. This leads us to regard that the Shivadigvijaya Bakhar is not an independent credible source, and the material found in it cannot be regarded as a proof to decide the validity of the matters stated in the Bakre Danapatra of Sambhaji or the Paramanandakavya.

As a result of these matters, it cannot be said by depending upon the contents of the Bakre Danapatra of Sambhaji or the Paramanandakavya or the Shivadigvijaya Bakhar that Shivaji had undertaken the Karnataka expediton in October, 1676, to conquer a second kingdom to satisfy the wishes of Queen Soyarabai to that effect. When we take into account the fact that for the material found in the Bakre Danapatra of Sambhaji, the Paramanandakavya and the Shivadigvijaya Bakhar pertaining to the antagonism

---

115. Joshi,P.S., Yuvaraj Sambhaji, Ani Mogal-Eka Kuta Prashna, (BISMQ LI, Nos. 1-4, p.88).
116. Introduction, (Shivadigvijaya Bakhar, p.5).

of Queen Soyarabai with Sambhaji prior to his desertion to the Mughals there does not exist any credible historical material to support it, we are required to draw the conclusion that before the desertion of Yuvaraj Sambhaji to the Mughals (13th, December, 1678) there did not exist in the house of Shivaji the problem of deciding his successor. The extant sources lead us to feel that the problem of deciding his successor got created in his house after the desertion of Yuvaraj Sambhaji to the Mughals and it is after that event onwards that Queen Soyarabai and the ministers of Shivaji have started acting against Sambhaji.

When Chhatrapati Shivaji was planning to realise higher political ideals in Karnataka we find that at home he was disturbed by the irrational conduct of his son, Yuvaraj Sambhaji. This is proved by the talk which Shivaji had with Sambhaji before going on the Karnataka expedition and which is reported by the Poet of the Paramanandakavya. Following is the relevant portion of that talk: "One day Shivaji addressed his son Sambhaji alone after sending away all his courtiers. Shivaji said to Sambhaji, people do not respect a son who inherits a kingdom of his father. The merits of of the son cannot be understood by his father if the son stays with him. My father, Shahaji, had also kept

me at Poona (away) from him when he was at Jinji). Due to my old age I find it difficult to protect my kingdom. Therefore I will give my entire kingdom to you. I will not give a share in that kingdom to yourstep-brother (Rajaram). For him I will conquer another kingdom. By that you both will be able to rule these kingdoms independently. I very much love my younger son Rajaram. Still he is not asking for his share from my kingdom for enjoyment. I have only one kingdom. Just as a human body cannot be cut into different parts like that the kingdom also cannot be cut into parts. "[117]

What reasons led Shivaji to have that talk with Sambhaji is not clearly stated in the Paramanandakavya. But when we find in it, Shivaji telling Sambhaji that "even your younger step-brother (Rajaram) is not asking for his share (Bhaga) from my kingdom for enjoyment" and that just as a human body cannot be cut into different parts like that the kingdom also cannot be cut into parts,[118] before it explicitly proves that Sambhaji had put up a demand before Shivaji to have his share in Shivaji's kingdom.

This fact stated in the Paramanandakavya about Sambhaji's demand for a share in the kingdom of Shivaji seems to be true. For its purport is corroborated by the account given in the Bakhar of Shivaji written by Krishnaji Anant

---

117. Paramanandakavya, Section III, Canto VII, Verses 1-67, Pp.60-67.
118. Ibid., Verses 78-79, p.65; Verse 83,p.66.

Sabhasad of the talk which Chhatrapati Shivaji had with Yuvaraj Sambhaji at fort Panhala at the time when after his desertion to the Mughals (13th December, 1678) Sambhaji had returned to the Svarajya (13th January, 1680).

When Shivaji met Sambhaji at Panhala, Shivaji said to him "Son, do not desert me ... with great efforts I have brought you back from Aurangzeb... You are my eldest son who has grown in age and I have understood that you want an independent kingdom.... For this, I give you one kingdom (of Karnataka)".[119]

In the talk in which Sambhaji demanded his share in the Svarajya from Shivaji, when Shivaji told Sambhaji that "just as a human body cannot be cut into parts, like that the division of the kingdom also cannot be made" and thereby turned down Sambhaji's proposal for a share in his kingdom, Sambhaji apparently pretended to agree with him.[120]

Though Shivaji seems to have taken lightly the demand of Sambhaji and brushed it aside, as he had sensed the immature inclinations of Sambhaji for political power, Shivaji seems to have thought it wise not to allow him to stay at Raigad and delegate government powers to him for the time for which he was to be in Karnataka.

---

119. Sabhasad- Shivaji Bakhar, p.93.

120. Paramanandakavya, Section III, Canto VII, Verses 95-109, Pp.67-68.

Therefore, while leaving on the Karnataka expedition in October, 1676, Chhatrapati Shivaji shifted Yuvaraj Sambhaji to Shringarpur, the administrative seat of the Subha of Prabhavali, and giving the administrative matters to the care of his ministers, Annaji Datto, Moropant and Dattopant, appointed Rahuji Somnath for the protection of Queen Soyarabai and prince Rajaram at Raigad.[121]

In their work on Sambhaji, neither V.S. Bendre nor Kamal Gokhale has taken into account the demand of Yuvaraj Sambhaji for his share (Bhaga) in the kingdom of Chhatrapati Shivaji which is stated in the Paramananda-kavya.

As a result, V.S. Bendre has been led to construct without conducting the scrutiny of the fabricated facts given in the Paramanandakavya, the version of the antagonism of Shivaji's ministers towards Sambhaji which is not supported by credible data from the extent historical sources. His contention that Chhatrapati Shivaji shifted Sambhaji to Shringarpur because he was goaded by his evil ministers in that[122] is untenable. For, there is no credible evidence available in the extent historical sources to prove that Shivaji's ministers were "evil" and were antagonistic towards Yuvaraj Sambhaji

---

121. Ibid., Section III, Canto VIII, Verses 1-3, p.68, Bendre - Sambhaji, p.64, 66.

122. Bendre - Sambhaji, p.64, 66.

before his desertion to the Mughals (13th December,1678). There also does not exist any credible evidence to show that Chhatrapati Shivaji was goaded by his ministers in his decision to shift Sambhaji from Raigad to Shringarpur. It was a decision of Chhatrapati Shivaji himself, and in taking it he was not goaded by his evil ministers who were antagonistic towards Sambhaji as is contended by V.S. Bendre solely on the basis of the facts gleaned from the incredible Paramanandakavya.

Similarly, Kamal Gokhale's contention that it was at the instance of Queen Soyarabai that Shivaji shifted Sambhaji to Shringarpur[123] cannot be accepted historically as sound. For, barring the incredible data available in the biassed sources like the Bakre Danapatra of Sambhaji, the Paramanandakavya and the Shivadigvijaya Bakhar there is no proof available in the extant credible sources to show that Queen Soyarabai was against Sambhaji in any way prior to his desertion to the Mughals (13th December, 1678).

---

123. Gokhale - Sambhaji, Pp.50-56.

Chapter IV

SAMBHAJI'S DESERTION TO THE MUGHALS

After Chhatrapati Shivaji shifted Yuvaraj Sambhaji from Raigad to Shringarpur in October, 1676, Sambhaji seems to have lived there with a bruised mind, as his demand for a share in the kingdom was turned down by Shivaji.

As there does not exist at present any credible historical data to show that Chhatrapati Shivaji had ever ill-treated Sambhaji, or the ministers of Shivaji, were antagonistic towards Sambhaji, and the step-mother of Sambhaji, Queen Soyarabai, had developed a feeling that instead of Sambhaji her son Rajaram should succeed to the throne of Shivaji upto the time Sambhaji deserted to the Mughals (13th December, 1678), we have no alternative to explain the cause of that demand except by ascribing it to the irrational thoughts which Sambhaji seems to have developed upto October, 1676.

Taking into account the data available in the Paramanandakavya about the influence of the Shakti cult over the course of life of Sambhaji during his stay at Shringarpur from October 1676 onwards,[1] we are inclined to feel that due to the influence of the matters involved in the practice of that cult, Sambhaji had become an irrational person. The data in the Paramanandakavya

---

1. Paramanandakavya, Section I, Verses 62-63, p.9; Section III, Canto, VIII, Verses 1-101, Pp.68-76.

which shows that Sambhaji was under the influence of the Shakti cult is true as it is supported by the Bakre Danapatra of Sambhaji of 24th August, 1680, which Sambhaji has given after becoming the Chhatrapati to a Mahamantrik (Great Sorcerer) surnamed Bakre in order to fulfil his vow which he had taken when he was a Yuvaraj and which he had promised to fulfil if he became successful in acquiring the throne of the Svarajya.[2] This shows that during the time when he was a Yuvaraj as well as when he became the Chhatrapati, Sambhaji was under the influence of sorcery. Since sorcery in itself is of irrational practices and the persons who practice it or who adhere to it are of irrational thoughts, we feel it likely, that Yuvaraj Sambhaji who adhered to it, seems to have become a person of irrational thoughts and ideas by October 1676. Therefore, in the life time of Chhatrapati Shivaji itself, he seems to have developed an immature political ambition to become a king himself after obtaining a share from Shivaji's kingdom when Shivaji was to leave the Svarajya for the Karnataka expedition. Shivaji, after hearing that evil inclination of Sambhaji, seems to have thought it dangerous to leave Sambhaji in

---

2. Bakre Danapatra, Pp. 432-434.

Charge of the government of the Svarajya during the time for which he was to go out of Maharashtra on the Karnataka expedition. Therefore, even though Sambhaji, by way of his position as a Yuvaraj was to be in charge of the government of the Svarajya during the time of the absence of Shivaji from the Svarajya, Shivaji seems to have thought it to be dangerous to allow Sambhaji to exercise that right. Probably, feeling that Sambhaji, who had developed an irrational idea of becoming a king in his life time itself, may usurp his throne of the Svarajya during the time of his absence, Shivaji might have thought it proper to remove Sambhaji from Raigad, the seat of his government, and keep him at Shringarpur.

The extant sources do not give any information about as to why Chhatrapati Shivaji decided to keep Yuvaraj Sambhaji at Shringarpur. As it is, Shringarpur had become a seat of the Shakti cult in Maharashtra during the time of Shivaji itself. Therefore, had Sambhaji developed clear inclination by October, 1676, towards that cult and sorcery, we feel, Chhatrapati Shivaji would not have kept Sambhaji at Shringarpur during the time of his Karnataka expedition when he was to be away from the Svarajya for a long period. This in a way proves that when Shivaji made Sambhaji stay at Shringarpur in October, 1676, the conduct of

Sambhaji upto that time must not have been such that Shivaji would have suspected from it, his strong and definite inclinations towards the Shakti cult, though from the rumours about his conduct of debauchery and his irrational demand for a share in the Svarajya it can be thought that on him there existed some influence of an irrational and bad company.

We feel it probable that Shivaji might have sensed this influence of bad and irrational company on Sambhaji and to free him from it Shivaji might have decided to keep Sambhaji at Shringarpur, a place to which Sambhaji's wife Yesubai belonged and where her kinsmen of the Shirke family stayed.[3]

The extant sources for the history of Sambhaji do not give full information about Sambhaji's stay at Shringarpur. But from the Paramanandakavya we get some information about the life which Yuvaraj Sambhaji spent at Shringarpur.

When Yuvaraj Sambhaji was residing at Shringarpur after October, 1676, he used to take physical exercises regurlarly. There, he learnt with great interest the science of Archery. At that place, he heard different Puranas, the Kamandakiya Nitisara and History from the learned persons.[4]

---

3. Bendre - Sambhaji, p.39.
4. Paramanandakavya, Section III, Canto VIII, Verses 17-20, p.69.

It is regarded by the scholars that Yuvaraj Sambhaji wrote his Sanskrit poetic work, the Budhabhushana probably during the time of his atay at Shringarpur.[5]

Since Shivaji had given the administration of the Subha of Prabhavali, whose seat of administration was Shringarpur, under Yuvaraj Sambhaji, Sambhaji was required to attend the work of that administration. The Paramanandakavya tells us that in his dealings with the people under that administration, Sambhaji showed consideration and kindness.[6] The Paramanandakavya also tells us that when the people of the Subha of Prabhavali had become happy under the administration of Sambhaji, the people from other districts of the Svarajya, who were put to harassment by the ministers of Shivaji, began to flock and settle in the Subha of Prabhavali. Seeing this, the minister left in Raigad by Shivaji for protecting Rajaram, was induced by Queen Soyarabai, the step-mother of Sambhaji, to raise rebellions in the Subha of Prabhavali and molest the people. But Yuvaraj Sambhaji suppressed that

---

5. Bendre - Sambhaji, p.37; Gokhale - Sambhaji, p.56, 434.

6. Section III, Canto VIII, Verses 21-23, p.69.

disorder.[7]

Both, V.S. Bendre[8] and Kamal Gokhale[9] have accepted as true the matters stated in the Paramanandakavya about the harassment to which the ministers of Shivaji used to put the subjects of the Svarajya.

Kamal Gokhale has not discussed in her work the reasons which have led her to accept the version given in the Paramanandakavya about the harassment of Shivaji's subjects by his ministers.

To prove his contention about the harassment of Shivaji's subjects by his ministers, which he has based upon the Paramanandakavya, V.S. Bendre has cited the matter found in the letter written by Yuvaraj Sambhaji to Annaji Datto, the Sachiv (Finance Minister) of Chhatrapati Shivaji, on 3rd November, 1678.[10]

In that letter, after paying his respects to Annaji Datto, Sambhaji has communicated to him that "Sadananda Gosavi was granted an Inam land (for the Matha) at the place Nimb. At present it is disallowed

---

7. Ibid., Verses 24-30, Pp.69-70.
8. Bendre - Sambhaji, p.68, 105-106.
9. Gokhale - Sambhaji, Pp. 56-57.
10. Rajwade Khanda XV, No.142, p.68.

to him (by the administration of the Svarajya). Due to this reason Sadanand Gosavi has communicated to me that his Inam land should be continued to him as before. I do not know about this case. Therefore, I have written to you about it. You may decide about this case the way you like."

More details of this case have been given by S.N. Joshi.[11] From those details it is seen that the Inam land in question was granted to the Math of Sadananda Gosavi with an intention of bringing it under cultivation. But it was not cultivated by that Matha during the two years of 1674-1675. Since the primary condition related to the grant of that land was not fulfilled by Sadananda Gosavi, the government of Shivaji cancelled the grant of that land according to the accepted principles. Seeing the cancellation of that land, Sadananda Gosavi represented that case to Yuvaraj Sambhaji even when the work of that case did not come under him. Sambhaji understood its unwarrented manner, and wrote about it to Annaji Datto, whose work it was to decide about those matters. By that it becomes clear that Sambhaji did not interfere in the work of Annaji Datto and that he followed the proper

---

11. Rajyakarbharacha Itihas, p.147.

practice of Shivaji's administration.

As from these details S.N. Joshi has proved that Sambhaji in the case of the Inam land of the Sadananda Gosavi's Matha showed due respect to Annaji Datto and his work of the Sachiv in the administration of Shivaji,[12] we cannot accept the surmise of V.S. Bendre that "Sambhaji was attending the complaints of the Subjects against the ministers of Shivaji and was giving decisions about them when he was at Shringarpur".[13]

On the basis of the data of the Paramanandakavya, V.S. Bendre has stated that some of the ministers of Chhatrapati Shivaji were "untruthful".[14] They and their assistants were putting the subjects to harassment";[15] and "upto the time of the death of Chhatrapati Shivaji, there did not exist ' Ramarajya ' (a good government) in the Svarajya".[16] V.S. Bendre has also taken into account the data of the travel account of Dr.John Frayer, an Englishman, to prove these contentions which pertain to the administration of Shivaji.

Dr. John Frayer has written in his travel account about the condition of the life of the people of Karwar when he visited that territory in 1676. He has

---

12. Ibid.
13. Bendre - Sambhaji, p.68.
14. Ibid., p.66.
15. Ibid., p.104.
16. Ibid., p.105.

stated that the Subhedars and other officers of Shivaji were ill-treating the people of the area of Athani and Hubli. Since Dr. Frayer was a foreigner, his writings are to be accepted with great reservations. Since what he has stated about the officers and the administration of Shivaji is not borne out by historical evidence,[17] we cannot accept the above stated surmises of V.S. Bendre.

The surmises of V.S. Bendre which are based on the writing of the Poet of the Paramanandakavya and the travel account of Frayer that the ministers of Shivaji were untruthful and by imposing various taxes they were putting to harassment the subjects in the Svarajya not only get disproved by the data available about the functioning of the administration of Shivaji and the better conditions of the life of the subjects under it; but also by the data found in the Budhabhushana, a Sanskrit poetic work composed by Yuvaraj Sambhaji himself.

According to V.S. Bendre, Yuvaraj Sambhaji started the composition of the Budhabhushana probably before October, 1677[18] i.e. when Sambhaji was staying at Shringarpur. Taking into account the life of turmoil

---

17. Joshi, P.S., Chhatrapati Shivaji Maharaj(1630-80 A.D.) Yanchya Kali Svarajyatil Prajajananche Jivan Purvipeksha Nirbhaya Va Sukhi Hote, (BIAS, XI,No.41, Pp.93-106).
18. Bendre - Sambhaji, p.37.

which Sambhaji lived after his desertion to Aurangzeb (13th December, 1678) to the time of his execution by Aurangzeb on 11th March, 1689, it is clear that Sambhaji had the necessary conditions of life to complete the writing of the Budhabhushana only during the time of his stay at Shringarpur upto 13th December, 1678.

It is interesting to note that when Sambhaji was staying at Shringarpur, he has stated in that work about Shivaji that " He (Chhatrapati Shivaji) it is, whose fort shines with palace and mansions in which princes dwell, with arches and beautiful market - squares, with new lakes filled with water all around, with learned priests, physicians and astrologers, with honest hereditary ministers and with the numberless brave armies of four kinds".[19]

When we find that even Sambhaji, the hero of the work of V.S. Bendre, regarded the ministers of Shivaji as "honest" when he stayed at Shringarpur; it disproves his contention that the ministers of Shivaji were "untruthful" persons who put the subjects of the Svarajya to harassment and that Sambhaji gave them "protection" and remission in the payment of texes.

---

19. Budhabhushana - Velankar, Verse 14, p.2.

Since there does not exist any proof in the extant sources to show that the ministers of Shivaji were putting the subjects of the Svarajya to harassment, the contention of V.S. Bendre to that effect, which is based on the contents given by the poet of the Paramanandakavya, a biassed source, cannot be accepted as true in the historical analysis.

On the basis of the contents of the Paramanandakavya, Kamal Gokhale has drawn a surmise that "Yuvaraj Sambhaji was doing good work in the administration of Shringarpur. Seeing that, Queen Soyarabai and her supporters became envious of Sambhaji. Therefore, they started creating trouble against him in the area of Shringarpur. But because Sambhaji was strong and capable person, they did not succeed against him".[20]

When we put the contents of the Paramanandakavya, on the basis of which Kamal Gokhale has based this surmise, to historical scrutiny, we do not find any credible support to it in the data of the extant historical sources. There is no credible data present in the extant historical sources to show that Queen Soyarabai and her supporters (ministers of Shivaji) were in any way against Yuvaraj Sambhaji prior to his desertion to the Mughals (13th December, 1678). Therefore, we cannot accept the above stated surmise

---

20. Gokhale - Sambhaji, p.57.

of Kamal Gokhale in the historical analysis.

Both V.S. Bendre and Kamal Gokhale could accept the contents of the Paramanandakavya to draw their above stated surmises as they do not regard that the Paramanandakavya is a biassed source for the history of Sambhaji.

The Portuguese sources[21] show that Yuvaraj Sambhaji had requested the Portuguese Viceroy of Goa, Dom Pedro de Almeida, to grant the facilities of voyage, probably to one of the Muslim subjects of the Svarajya, to go to Mecca(for a pilgrimage to that place). The Portuguese Viceroy of Goa, in return to Sambhaji's communication, wrote on 1st December, 1677, to him that the facility which he had sought (probably for his Muslim subject) to go to Mecca will be given by the Portuguese Government in Goa.[22]

This shows that Yuvaraj Sambhaji was attending the needs of the subjects of the Svarajya through his administration at Shringarpur and that he was not kept under surveillance by Shivaji at that place as is thought by Sardesai, G.S.[23]

Though the Poet of the Paramanandakavya gives us historically incredible information about the actions of Queen Soyarabai and the ministers of Shivaji

---

21. Boletim da Filmoteca Ultramarina Portuguese, IV (Lisbon, 1959), p.527; VII (Lisbon,1962),p.237.
22. Ibid., IV, p.527; VII, p.237.
23. Sardesai-NHM-I, p.261.

against Yuvaraj Sambhaji, he gives us credible facts about the mischievous activities of Sambhaji and his friends of the Shakti cult which they had conducted at Shringarpur against Chhatrapati Shivaji.

As has been pointed out earlier, Yuvaraj Sambhaji, whose demand for a share in the kingdom of Shivaji was turned down by Chhatrapati Shivaji, lived in dissatisfaction at Shringarpur. At that place, which was a centre of the Shakti or Tantrik cult, Sambhaji seems to have come clearly under that cult and there he seems to have become more irrational in thought.

This is proved by the fact that at Shringarpur Yuvaraj Sambhaji had around him the persons of the Shakti or Tantrik cult and there he performed the worship of Goddess Kali. It seems that because he was under the influence of the low class priests of that cult, who followed the practices of acquiring the subsidiary fruits of Tantrik worship (bewitching other people - especially women, - transmitting baser metals into gold, etc.), Sambhaji became an irrational person, and on 23rd March, 1678, performing his " Kalashabhishek " at Shringarpur, he declared himself as Svayampurna[24] (independent).

---

24. Paramanandakavya, Section I, Verse 62, p.93.

Though V.S. Bendre[25] has taken a note of this irrational conduct of Sambhaji at Shringarpur, he has not used it to interpret the irresponsible behaviour of Sambhaji which he conducted against Chhatrapati Shivaji at that place. It is stunning to see that even though Chhatrapati Shivaji had turned down the demand of Sambhaji for a share (Bhaga) in his kingdom and Sambhaji had shown reconciliation with his wise words that " just as a human body cannot be cut into parts, like that the division of the kingdom also cannot be made"; in Shivaji's life time itself and especially when he was away from the Svarajya in Karnataka, Yuvaraj Sambhaji, who had a fine training in the administration of the Svarajya and who had been brought up in an inspiring patriotic atmosphere of the house of Shivaji; should have set up himself as a rival in the Svarajya to Chhatrapati Shivaji. For, as T.S. Shejawalkar has pointed out[26] the Kalashabhisheka was a coronation ceremony performed of Sambhaji according to the Tantrik rites of the Shakti cult.

V.S. Bendre is also of the opinion that by performing the Kalashabhisheka, Yuvaraj Sambhaji

---

25. Sambhaji, Pp. 68-69.
26. Shejawalkar, T.S., Shivaji-Sambhaji Sambandha, (Shiva Chhatrapati, p. 145).

declared himself as Svayampurna (independent).[27]

Kamal Gokhale does not agree with the contention of V.S. Bendre that Yuvaraj Sambhaji declared himself as Svayampurna (independent). She states that " the Kalashabhisheka is performed to gain control over the body and mind in the Shakti or Tantrik cult. When one succeeds in gaining that control, he can enslave the unseen ghosts in the world; can cure diseases and can beget children if one does not have them. To achieve Moksha is the ultimate aim of the Shakti or Tantrik cult".[28]

Taking into account the matters of the Shakti or Tantrik cult, it becomes clear that the fact stated by V.S. Bendre about Sambhaji's declaration as a Svayampurna (independent) is correct. For, Yuvaraj Sambhaji does not appear to have undertaken that activity to beget children, as his daughter, Bhavanibai, to his wife Yesubai was born on 4th September, 1678.[29] Yuvaraj Sambhaji also does not seem to be a person who was interested in the acquirement of the Moksha. Had he been interested in it, he would not have asked for a share in the kingdom

---

27. Bendre - Sambhaji, Pp.68-69.
28. Gokhale - Sambhaji, Pp. 430-431.
29. Apte, D.V., Shivaji Maharajanchi Khari Janmatithi, (Shiva Charitra Pradip,p.267). Shri.Apte has given this correct date after comparing the entry of the birth date of Bhavanibai found in the "Sampurna Shivakalin Shakavali" of the Purandare Collection with that of the clumsy entry of the same matter found in the Jedhe Shakavali, p.29. This date given by Shri. Apte has been accepted as correct by eminent historians like S.N. Joshi, (Sambhaji Shakavali,p.100); and G.H. Khare, Paramanandakavya (Shiva Charitra Samshodhan Vritta, Rajyabhishek Shake-279,p.11).

of Shivaji and after deserting to the Mughals, with their collusion,would not have attacked the Svarajya and conquered its Bhupalgad in the subsequent period of his life.

It is then clear from the Paramanandakavya that by the performance of the Kalashabhisheka, Yuvaraj Sambhaji wanted to enslave the unseen ghots in the world at Shringarpur.

As to why Yuvaraj Sambhaji wanted to enslave the unseen ghosts in the world becomes clear when we take into account the expression of joy and satisfaction of the poet of the Paramanandakavya that "because of the performance of the Kuveda (performance of a wicked scheme to obtain an object, i.e. the enslavement of ghosts in this case which was performed by the persons of Shakti or Tantrik cult who were the friends of Sambhaji), Chhatrapati Shivaji, who was an obstacle in the way of Sambhaji to obtain kingdom, died unexpectedly in three years. This made the fear(about Shivaji and of obtaining the kingdom) of Sambhaji disappear".[30] It is difficult to feel that Sambhaji did not have the knowledge of the performance of this kuveda.

All these facts from the Paramanandakavya are credible as they relate the expected beneficial results of the mischievous acts of Sambhaji and his friends and as they

---

30. Paramanandakavya, Section I, Verses 61-68, Pp.9-10.

those have been narrated by the partisan of Sambhaji with a sense of joy and satisfaction.[31]

The Mughal general, Dilerkhan, who was the Viceroy of the Deccan during that time, seems to have been in the know of the dissatisfaction of Yuvaraj Sambhaji about not having obtained a share in the kingdom of Shivaji. He wrote a letter to Sambhaji. The contents of that letter have been stated in the Paramanandakavya by its poet. From those contents we learn that Dilerkhan told Sambhaji that "you being a good person, Aurangzeb likes you. Therefore, you come quickly to me and secure his protection. Emperor Aurangzeb, who has a desire to conquer the Sahyadri mountain(Svarajya) and to see your brave deeds, wishes to see that you are well-off. Aurangzeb is feeling great dissatisfaction over the fact that he has not been able to conquer the Sahyadri mountain (Svarajya). Therefore, you please him by giving your help (to conquer the Svarajya). You receive the territory, the elephants, the horses and the Farman of his signature which he has sent for you. So you come to me without having any doubt in your mind. You can stay (in the Mughal camp with me) according to your wishes and without any conditions (to bind you). Therefore, you secure your good".[32]

---

31. Joshi,P.S., Yuvaraj Sambhaji Ani Mugal-Ekakuta Prashna, (BISM, LI, p.88).
32. Paramanandakavya, Section III, Canto IX,Verses 1-17, Pp.76-77.

Setu Madhavrao Pagadi feels that this was an effort of Dilerkhan to seduce Sambhaji according to the various manoeuvres which Aurangzeb had employed against Shivaji.[33]

Yuvaraj Sambhaji read that letter of Dilerkhan carefully and sent his reply to it. Seeing that Sambhaji had replied his letter Dilerkhan felt much joy. The poet of the Paramanandakavya has given the contents of Sambhaji's reply as follows. "As you wish, I want to come over to Emperor Aurangzeb. But I cannot come to you at present. This is because my father (Chhatrapati Shivaji) has given the territory of Shringarpur (the Subha of Prabhavali) under me. As I have given a promise to him (to look after that territory), I cannot come to you till the time he returns (from the Karnataka expedition)".[34]

From these contents of the letter of Yuvaraj Sambhaji which are given by his partisan poet of the Paramanandakavya, V.S. Bendre[35] has drawn the inference that those contents indicate that Sambhaji was "faithful

---

33. Shivaji, - Pagadi, p.293,298; has pointed out this on the basis of Francois Martin, The Karnataka expedition (Sen, S.N., Foreign Biographies of Shivaji, p.332). Martin has stated that Shivaji arrested his brother-in-law and had his eyes put out as he was involved in a conspiracy with the Mogal (Aurangzeb) against him. Pagadi feels that the said brother-in-law of Shivaji was Shekhoji Gaikwad.
34. Paramanandakavya, Verses 18-31, Pp.77-78.
35. Bendre - Sambhaji, p.71.

and obedient to Shivaji" even though from those contents the intention of Sambhaji to join the Mughals against Shivaji gets clearly proved.

On the basis of those contents, V.S. Bendre has also tried to show that Sambhaji was a diplomatic person. For, according to him, Sambhaji did not allow the negotiations of peace spoiled which Chhatrapati Shivaji had started with Aurangzeb in 1675. On the basis of the English records, V.S. Bendre feels that Shivaji, before going on the Karnataka expedition had pretended to sue for peace with Aurangzeb; but leaving those negotiations incomplete, he had gone from the Svarajya for the Karnataka expedition.[36]

A careful study of the contents of the letter of Yuvaraj Sambhaji to Dilerkhan reveals that the surmises drawn by V.S. Bendre on their basis about Sambhaji are not correct. For, those contents clearly reveal the evil inclinations of Yuvaraj Sambhaji to defect to Aurangzeb. We feel that if Sambhaji had really been a patriotic and devoted person to the Svarajya and his father, Chhatrapati Shivaji, he would have naturally at the outset become angry as soon as he read the proposal of Dilerkhan seeking

---

36. Ibid., Pp. 69-71.

his defection from Shivaji and would have abhorred the idea of getting defected from Shivaji and join Aurangzeb, who was an avowed enemy of the Svarajya and Shivaji. But surprisingly, we find that instead of showing that type of reaction to the proposal of Dilerkhan, Sambhaji merely wrote to him that at present he will not defect to the mughals and impliedly communicated to Dilerkhan that he was prepared to go over to the Mughals in future. Seeing this implied acceptance of his proposal by Sambhaji, Dilerkhan felt joy.[37] It is clear from this that Sambhaji was neither 'faithful' nor 'obedient' to Chhatrapati Shivaji as is contended by V.S. Bendre.

The surmise of V.S. Bendre that by telling Dilerkhan that he will not go over to the Mughals at that time Sambhaji did not allow to get spoiled the negotiations of peace which Shivaji had started with the Mughals in 1675 cannot be accepted as true. For, according to V.S. Bendre himself, while going on the Karnataka expedition, Chhatrapati Shivaji had given his administration under the care of his trusted ministers, and by denying the right of a Yuvaraj to Sambhaji to look after his administration during the time of his absence from the Svarajya, he had shifted Sambhaji from Raigad to Shringarpur.[38]

---

37. Paramanandakavya, Section III, Canto.IX, Verses 18-21, P.77; Bendre - Sambhaji, p. 71.
38. Bendre - Sambhaji, Pp. 64-66.

According to that arrangement, Sambhaji had no business to entertain the proposals made by Dilerkhan of the so-called peace of 1675 which Shivaji himself had once rejected in July, 1675.[39] Sambhaji, if really he was faithful and obedient to Shivaji, could have very well written to Dilerkhan that he should decide about those matters with Shivaji after when he returns to the Svarajya from the Karnataka expedition. Instead of following this correct approach to answer the letter of Dilerkhan, when we find Sambhaji showing his preparedness to defect to the Mughals from the Svarajya at a later time, we cannot accept the surmises of V.S. Bendre by which he says that Sambhaji was faithful and obedient to Shivaji, and that he exerted diplomatically for not getting spoiled the negotiations of peace which Shivaji had started with Aurangzeb in 1675. This also leads us to set aside the contention of Kamal Gokhale[40] that in this matter (Sambhaji's correspondence with Dilerkhan), Sambhaji is seen as not giving up the responsibility which Shivaji has delegated to him. She has stated this contention in her work on the basis of the same data of the Paramanandakavya which V.S. Bendre has taken into account and which she has not discussed

---

39. Busatinussalatin - Parasnis-Bendre, Pp.497-498; Sen-ERS-II, No.63, p.34; No.72,Pp.37-38; No.110, Pp. 62-63; Sarkar-Aurangzib IV, Pp.211-212; Bendre-Sambhaji, Pp.58-59.
40. Gokhale - Sambhaji, Pp.57-58.

with the help of any other evidence.

By taking into account the contents of the letter which Yuvaraj Sambhaji wrote to Dilerkhan, it appears that though Sambhaji was mentally prepared to join the Mughals against Shivaji, he avoided that at that very time probably because he must have realised the serious implications of that step for his future. To avoid those implications, he might have thought it better to ask from Shivaji his share in the Svarajya once again after his return from the Karnataka expedition. It is likely that as Sambhaji was a person of irrational thoughts, he might have thought of using the offer made by Dilerkhan to bring pressure on Shivaji and obtain his share from the territory of the Svarajya.

Meanwhile, after his successful expedition in Karnataka Chhatrapati Shivaji returned to the Svarajya in May, 1678.[41] It appears that Yuvaraj Sambhaji again asked from him his share in the Svarajya. When Chhatrapati Shivaji learnt about the mischievous activity conducted by Sambhaji at Shringarpur, Shivaji seems to have turned down Sambhaji's demand, and to take him out of the evil atmosphere, he seems to have asked Sambhaji to go to Parali(Sajjangad).[42]

---

41. Jedhe Shakavali, p. 29.
42. Paramanandakavya, Section III, Canto X, Verses 1-25, Pp. 80-81.

The poet of the Paramanandakavya has narrated the step of Chhatrapati Shivaji to shift Yuvaraj Sambhaji from Shringarpur to Parali (Sajjangad) in such a manner that his version about that step cannot be accepted in scientific history.

While narrating the step of Shivaji of removing Sambhaji from Shringarpur and asking him to go to Parali (Sajjangad) the poet of the Paramanandakavya tells us that the ministers of Shivaji complained to him about the matters of Sambhaj's stay at Shringarpur. They told Shivaji that "Sambhaji wishes to go over to Aurangzeb. Though we behave most humbly to Sambhaji, he treats us adversely. He gives remissions to the subjects in the payment of taxes. Due to that there is a deficit in the collection of taxes by the government".[43] The poet further tells us that after hearing these matters about Sambhaji, Chhatrapati Shivaji wrote a letter to Yuvaraj Sambhaji. Shivaji wrote in it that "You are giving remissions to the subjects in the payment of taxes. You are also openly insulting my ministers. Therefore, you leave Shringarpur and go to stay at Parali (Sajjangad).[44]

When these matters narrated by the poet are subjected to historical inquiry, it becomes clear that the ministers

---

43. Ibid., Verses 6-21, Pp. 80-81.
44. Ibid., Verses 23-26, p.81.

of Shivaji were not wrong in telling Shivaji about the collusion which Sambhaji had developed with the Mughals against Shivaji. This is true because of the fact that subsequently (13th December, 1678) Sambhaji actually deserted to the Mughal general Dilerkhan and when he was nearing the Mughal camp and was pursued by the men of Shivaji, he sent a message to Dilerkhan that "I have come near your camp. Men of Shivaji are pursuing me. You send your troops to help me".[45] This message Sambhaji would not have been able to send to Dilerkhan had he not decided about the matters of his desertion with Dilerkhan prior to his desertion from the Svarajya. (13th December, 1678).

But his narration that the ministers of Shivaji told him that "Sambhaji treats us adversely and he gives remissions to the subjects in the payment of taxes", cannot be accepted as true. For, in the available historical documents there is no credible evidence to prove that Sambhaji, prior to his desertion to Dilerkhan had ever treated the ministers of Shivaji adversely. Similarly, there is no reliable evidence available to prove that Sambhaji had at any time given remissions to the subjects of the Svarajya in the payment of their taxes to the government. Therefore, we regard that this

---

45. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha - Pagadi, p.71.

information given by the poet of the Paramanandakavya is fictitious and as the one which has been narrated by him with a motive to slander the ministers of Shivaji. It is a baseless attempt on the part of the poet by which he has tried to show that the ministers of Shivaji were antagonistic towards Sambhaji prior to his desertion to Aurangzeb (13th December, 1678). As a result, we cannot regard as true the matters which the poet says that Shivaji had written about the adverse treatment given by Sambhaji to his ministers as well as his writing in the letter to Sambhaji that Sambhaji gave remissions to the subjects of the Svarajya in the payment of taxes to the Maratha government.

Since the incredibility of what the poet of the Paramanandakavya has written about the ministers of Shivaji gets proved as shown above, we have to set aside the surmises of V.S. Bendre that the ministers of Shivaji reported in a "perverted manner" the friendship which Sambhaji had developed with Dilerkhan and that "Sambhaji had kept Shivaji informed from time to time about his secret correspondence with Dilerkhan".[46] We are also led to regard as incredible his versions that because Sambhaji had not told them about his correspondence with Dilerkhan, the ministers of Shivaji felt insulted and they sensed that insult more when they saw that Shivaji

---

46. Bendre - Sambhaji, Pp. 71-72.

was not reprimanding Sambhaji for his having not told the ministers of Shivaji about the correspondence which he had conducted with Dilerkhan.

Had Shivaji been kept informed by Sambhaji about the correspondence which Sambhaji had conducted with Dilerkhan, he would not have got upset to the extent of ordering Sambhaji to leave Shringarpur and go to Parali (Sajjangad) when he heard the complaints about that correspondence from his ministers. Sambhaji's collusion with Dilerkhan seems to be one of the real causes which led Shivaji to make Sambhaji leave Shringarpur especially when the contents of the letter of Shivaji to Sambhaji (Sambhaji treated Shivaji's ministers adversely, Sambhaji gave remissions to the subjects in the payment of taxes, etc.) are not supported by any extant sources as shown earlier. Hence there is no credance in the above stated version that the ministers of Shivaji felt more insulted when they found that inspite of their telling Shivaji that Sambhaji had not told them about the correspondence which he had with Dilerkhan, he was not reprimanding Sambhaji. The fact which appears to be true in this matter is that Sambhaji had kept his correspondence with Dilerkhan as secret from both, Shivaji as well the ministers; and Shivaji learnt about it only when his ministers reported

to him about it after his return from the Karnataka expedition.

The other cause which appears as instrumental in Sambhaji's removal from Shringarpur to Parali(Sajjangad) by Shivaji is found in the Panta Pratinidhichi Bakhar. From that Bakhar we come to know that at "Shringarpur Sambhaji committed an outrage on a woman".[47]

Though this Bakhar seems to have been written in 1844 A.D.,[48] it shows the impression which prevailed in the 18th century about Sambhaji. The above stated entry in it, which relates the awkward conduct of Sambhaji at Shringarpur, is also clumsily written in it. Therefore, it is a problem as to what degree of credence should be ascribed to it.

Even though the above entry in the Pant Pradinidhichi Bakhar has different limitations for accepting it as credible, it appears after taking into account the association of Sambhaji with the followers of the Shakti cult and thereby with the Panch Makaras of the cult, that the awkward conduct of that cult of some followers of committing an outrage on a woman at Shringarpur might

---

47. Pant Pratinidhichi Bakhar, (Bharat Varsha No.2, Margashirsha, Shake 1818, p.17); Panta Pratinidhinchya Bakharivaril Tippan, (Bharat Varsha, No.8,Jyeshtha, Shake 1819, p.6).
48. Panta Pratinidhinchi Bakhar, (Bharat Varsha, No.2,p.1).

have been ascribed to Sambhaji. This appears to be true as there does not exist in the extant sources any credible data to prove that Sambhaji at any time in his life was a person of loose morals towards women. Moreover, had Sambhaji really acted in an offensive way towards any woman at Shringarpur, Chhatrapati Shivaji, who had earned a reputation of even upholding the honour of the women of his enemies, would have severely punished Sambhaji and would not have remained satisfied only in shifting Sambhaji from Shringarpur to Parali (Sajjangad).

According to the order of Chhatrapati Shivaji, Yuvaraj Sambhaji left Shringarpur and started residing at Parali (Sajjangad). As to when did he come to reside at Parali (Sajjangad) is not clearly known from the extant sources. Kamal Gokhale's inference[49] based on the Shiva Charitra Pradip (Jedhe Shakavali) that Sambhaji went to (Sajjangad) some time before 3rd November, 1678, is not correct as none of its entries say to that effect. Similarly, since V.S. Bendre has not given any reference to his contention[50] that Sambhaji went to Parali (Sajjangad) after July, 1678, and before November, 1678, his contention cannot be accepted as correct.

Some information about Yuvaraj Sambhaji's stay at

---

49. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.59.
50. Bendre--Sambhaji, p.74.

Parali (Sajjangad) is found in the Paramanandakavya. The poet of that work tells us that Sambhaji was lodged in the citadel of Parali (Sajjangad) with all honour by its commandant. According to him, there, one midnight the Devi (Goddess Kali) spoke to Yuvaraj Sambhaji, "Go quickly to the army of the king of Delhi (Aurangzeb). No one will be able to hinder you on the way".

Next day, 13th December, 1678, early in the morning, Yuvaraj Sambhaji told the commandant of the fort of Parali that he wished to go to the sacred place of Mahuli to take a bath in the sacred confluence of the rivers Krishna and Venna on that festival day (Parvani). Sambhaji then asked him to give a small escort with him. After taking that small escort, Yuvaraj Sambhaji went to Mahuli and took bath and gave away much money in charity. He then told the men of his escort to go back to the fort of Parali. With them he gave a message for the commandant of that fort and for Chhatrapati Shivaji that he "was going over to Aurangzeb; and he would return to conquer the Sahyadri mountain (Svarajya)".[51] After that, as was planned previously between Sambhaji and Dilerkhan, Sambhaji along with his few attendants which included few females went over to

---

51. Paramanandakavya, Section III, Canto X, Verses 40-56, Pp. 82-84.

the Mughal troops which Dilerkhan had sent to bring Sambhaji to the Mughal camp.[52] The Mughal troops then led Sambhaji and brought him safely to the camp of Dilerkhan.[53] When Sambhaji was heading towards the camp of Dilerkhan, it seems that the Maratha troops, probably sent by Shivaji to capture Sambhaji, pursued him. Sambhaji, therefore, sent a message to Dilerkhan that "I have come near your camp. The troops of Shivaji are pursuing me.

---

52. Ibid., Verses 57-59, p.84; Busatinussalatin-Parasnis-Bendre,p.527; Persian Akhabar of 27th November,1681, referred to by Kamal Gokhale (Sambhaji,p.63,F.N.3), states that when Sambhaji deserted to the Mughals, he had with him his wife and his sister. (See also, Chitnis-Shivaji Bakhar, p.236). Both, the Persian Akhabar as well as Chitnis, have not given the name of the wife of Sambhaji. Probably on the basis of Chitnis, Sarkar,J.,(Shivaji and His Times, p.317) and Sardesai, G.S., (Shivaji, p.203), have given the name of Sambhaji's wife as Yesubai.This seems to be improbable, as Yesubai, who had given birth to her daughter Bhavanibai on 4th September, 1678, must not have been in a position to undertake the hazardous risk involved in the desertion to the Mughals on 13th December, 1678.
In contrast to J. Sarkar and G.S. Sardesai, Kamal Gokhale, (Sambhaji, p.63), has given Durgabai as the probable name of the wife of Sambhaji who went along with him in the Mughal camp while stating about the matter found in the Persian Akhabar referred to above. From the documents brought to light by A.G. Pawar, (TKK-I, No.143, p.195, No.322, p.484; No.361, p.543), it is found that in addition to Yesubai, Sambhaji had anotherwife or a concubine named Durgabai. See, Rao, V.D., Matushri Durgabai (BIAS IV, No.24, Pp.35-39). It is not yet known from the extant sources as to from which family Durgabai came and as to when Sambhaji married her. Shri. Setu Madhavrao Pagadi has, however, suggested to me in a discussion that Durgabai was a attendant of Sambhaji. His view is based on the contents of the document found in Sardesai,G.S.,Kulkarni,K.P., Kale, Y.M., Ed., Aitihasik Patravyavahar,No.6,Pp.8-9. I am grateful for the suggestion to Shri. Pagadi.

53. Paramanandakavya, Section III, Canto X, Verses 60-67, Pp.84-85.

You send your troops to help me".[54] Dilerkhan then sent Ikhalaskhan, the Mughal general with four thousand troops for the help of Sambhaji. Ikhalaskhan met Sambhaji at a distance of four Kos from the town of Supe. Seeing those large number of Mughal troops, the Maratha troops, which were in small number, gave up their pursuit of Sambhaji. When Sambhaji and Ikhalaskhan crossed some distance, Dilerkhan came in haste to receive Sambhaji. Dilerkhan and Sambhaji met each other in the village Karkamb.[55] When Sambhaji reached the camp of Dilerkhan, Dilerkhan handed over to him the Farman which emperor Aurangzeb had sent earlier for him. According to it Sambhaji was given a Mansab of seven thousand. He was also given one elephant, three horses, a dress, a sword and drums which were suitable for his position.[56]

The desertion of Sambhaji seems to be an effect of the Mansabdari system followed by emperor Aurangzeb. By the time of the desertion of Sambhaji, many Maratha nobles had been attracted due to it to the Mughal court. It could be that in his whim to realize his personal ambition for a share in the kingdom of Shivaji, Sambhaji

---

54. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha - Pagadi, p.71.
55. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha of Bhimsen, Ed. Khobrekar, V.G., p.122. Karkamb is in Sholapur District (Ibid., p.16, F.N.1).
56. Busatinussalatin - Parasnis-Bendre, Pp.527-528.

did not understand the implications of his going over to the Mughals. He seems to have thought that by going over to the Mughals he was not committing a grave offence like treason to the Maratha State.*

The desertion of Yuvaraj Sambhaji to emperor Aurangzeb must have given a great shock to Chhatrapati Shivaji and to the subjects of the Svarajya. That action of Sambhaji has proved to be the saddest one in the history of the Svarajya.

Writing about this episode in the life of that valiant prince, Grant Duff,[57] Sardesai,G.S.[58] and Sarkar, J.N.,[59] have given "the outrage of Sambhaji on a married Brahman woman and Shivaji's intention to punish Sambhaji for that offence" as a cause for the desertion of Yuvaraj Sambhaji to Aurangzeb. In the source material of Maratha history, the same cause has been alluded to for the desertion of Yuvaraj Sambhaji to Aurangzeb in the Bakhar of Shivaji[60] written by Malhar Ramrao Chitnis in 1811 A.D.[61]

This cause given by Chitnis has not been stated by Krishnaji Anant Sabhasad in his Bakhar of Shivaji while

---

* I owe this suggestion to Shri. Setu Madhavrao Pagadi.

57. Grant Duff-HM-I, p. 235.
58. Sardesai - Shivaji, Pp.202-203.
59. Sarkar - Aurangzib IV, p.222.
60. Chitnis - Shivaji Bakhar, Pp.235-236.
61. Hervadkar, R.V., Introduction (Chitnis - Shivaji Bakhar, p.17).

writing about this episode. Sabhasad, who was a contemporary to that event, states that "Sambhaji became angry with Shivaji and deserted to the Mughals".[62]

Bendre, V.S., has rejected the cause given by Chitnis by saying that "it is based on heresay which develops out of such episode in a later period of its occurance". With the help of the contemporary English evidence, he has shown that "Sambhaji's discontentment with Shivaji" was the cause of his desertion to Aurangzeb.[63]

Kamal Gokhale also has rejected the cause given by Chitnis on the grounds of her belief that had Sambhaji committed such a grave offence, Shivaji would not have treated him well after his return to Svarajya from the Mughals.[64]

Taking into account the available evidence, it appears that the cause stated by Chitnis is not correct. For, had Sambhaji committed that offence, the contemporaries like Krishnaji Anant Sabhasad, the English Factory news reporters and Bhimsen Saxena[65] would not have written that Sambhaji deserted Shivaji because of his anger and discontentment with Shivaji.

---

62. Sabhasad - Shivaji Bakhar, Pp.92-93.
63. Bendre - Sambhaji, Pp. 75-76.
64. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.64. The contention of Dr.(Smt.) Kamal Gokhale that the Jedhe Shakavali (p.29) says that 'Sambhaji deserted to the Mughals as he was angry with Shivaji (Ibid., p.62) is not correct, as the entries of the Jedhe-Shakavali do not suggest that.
65. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha - Pagadi, Pp.70-71.

Though V.S. Bendre and Kamal Gokhale have rejected the cause given by Chitnis about the desertion of Sambhaji to Aurangzeb, they have not rendered the analysis of the fact as to why Malhar Ramrao Chitnis, who belonged to the family which was loyal to the house of Shivaji and whose members were hereditary officials continuously in their service, has stated the "outrage committed by Sambhaji on a married Brahman woman and Shivaji's intention to punish Sambhaji for that offence" as a cause for the desertion of Sambhaji to Aurangzeb.

It seems that in his writing Malhar Ramrao Chitnis wanted to communicate to his readers that Sambhaji was not a person of good conduct, as previous to his becoming the Chhatrapati he had performed anti-Svarajya activities by joining the Mughals during December, 1678, to December, 1679.[66] Chitnis, who was a loyal hereditary official in the Satara Court of Chhatrapati Shahu II, a descendant of Sambhaji, might have thought it impertinent to state the anti-Svarajya activities of Yuvaraj Sambhaji in his writing especially when Sambhaji had ruled over the Svarajya as a coronated king during 1680-1689, after the death of Chhatrapati Shivaji. It appears that as Chitnis was in a way unable to state in his writing about the anti-Svarajya activities of Sambhaji, he has stated in

---

66. Sambhaji Shakavali, Pp.100-101.

his work " an outrage on a married Brahman woman by Sambhaji" in order to show that Sambhaji was not a person of good conduct.

A similar cause, like that of the cause stated by Chitnis, for the desertion of Yuvaraj Sambhaji to Aurangzeb, has been stated in the Busatinussalatin. It tells[67] that "during the days earlier to his desertion (to Aurangzeb), Sambhaji was much attracted towards the daughter of Sharahanavis (Sherenavis).[68] That disturbed the mind of Shivaji very much. Therefore, Shivaji wished either to kill or arrest Sambhaji. When Sambhaji understood the desire of Shivaji, Sambhaji became suspicious about him. Sambhaji then determined to go to Dilerkhan and after writing a letter to Dilerkhan, he went over to him."

Kamal Gokhale[69] has pointed out that it was Annaji Datto, who was holding the post of the Sharahanavis (Surnis) in the administration of Shivaji at the time when Sambhaji deserted to the Mughals. It, therefore, is proved that the Busatinussalatin conveys that Sambhaji was much attracted towards the daughter of Annaji Datto and that led Shivaji to get enraged and think about either of killing or arresting Sambhaji.

Kamal Gokhale has rejected the version given by the Busatinussalatin on the ground that had Sambhaji committed

---

67. Busatinussalatin - Parasnis-Bendre, p.527.
68. Busatinussalatin - Khare, p.100.
69. Gokhale - Sambhaji, p.62, F.N.5.

such a grave offence, Shivaji, who was very much strict in protecting the honour of women, would not have excused Sambhaji after his return to the Svarajya from the Mughal camp but would have given death sentence to him.[70]

Analysing that version, she has stated that Queen Soyarabai, who desired that Sambhaji should not get the throne of Shivaji, might have spread that type of news in order to disrepute Sambhaji and to show that her son Rajaram was a good prince. To substantiate her contention, she has stated that a "story" given in the 'Prabhuratnamala' shows that Queen Soyarabai had through Umaji Pandit made Sambhaji an addict to vices.[71]

The version of Kamal Gokhale about the attempt of Queen Soyarabai to disrepute Sambhaji with a wish that he should not get the throne of Shivaji does not appear to be correct. For, as has been shown earlier, there does not exist any credible historical data to show that Queen Soyarabai was against Sambhaji in any way before his desertion to Aurangzeb (13th December, 1678). The work, Prabhuratnamala, on the basis of whose "story" she has tried to prove the attempt on the part of Queen Soyarabai to make Sambhaji an addict to vices through Umaji Pandit, is not at all a historical source book.

---

70. Ibid. p. 64.
71. Ibid. p. 63.

It is a book written by S.B. Mujumdar which contains the stories of the lives of well-known Kayastha persons who had rendered meritorious service to the Svarajya. Those stories have been written by S.B. Mujumdar with the help of the data found in the sources like the Shivadigvijaya Bakhar[72] which has absurd material in it and which is written with the help of the earlier sources like the incredible Paramanandakavya. When there does not exist any credible source to prove that Queen Soyarabai had tried to make Sambhaji an addict to vices through Umani Pandit, the contention of Kamal Gokhale cannot be accepted as true.

The cause given by the Busatinussalatin for the desertion of Sambhaji to the Mughals does not appear to be true. This is because, Busatinussalatin has been written by Muhammad Ibrahim Azzubairi in 1824 A.D. with the help of earlier Persian historical sources.[73] Since it is written after the Shivaji Bakhar of Malhar Ramrao Chitnis, whose period of writing is 1811 A.D. it is probable that the cause stated by Chitnis in it for the desertion of Yuvaraj Sambhaji to the Mughals that "Sambhaji committed an outrage on a married Brahman woman

---

72. For example see, Mujumdar, S.B., Prabhuratnamala, p. 171.
73. Busatinussalatin - Khare, Pp.90-91; Bendre, V.S., see Editor's Preface, (Busatinussalatin - Parasnis-Bendre, Pp.23-24).

and therefore Shivaji wanted to punish him" might have found an echo in the Busatinussalatin. Additionally, it is probable that the author of the Busatinussalatin might have in his mind the opposition of Annaji Datto, the Surnis (Sherenavis) of Shivaji, to Sambhaji in becoming the Chhatrapati after the death of Shivaji. Instead of having a correct idea about the cause of Annaji Datto's opposition to Sambhaji (that he opposed Sambhaji's coming to the throne of Shivaji because he had by deserting to the Mughals had earlier conducted anti-Svarajya activities) the author of the Busatinussalatin, who probably was in the know of the cause of desertion of Sambhaji given by Chitnis, seems to have written about Sambhaji's love with the daughter of Annaji Datto.

This data of the Busatinussalatin can be interpreted only on these lines as there does not exist any support to its contention in the extant historical sources for the history of Sambhaji.

After rejecting the cause given by Chitnis for the desertion of Yuvaraj Sambhaji to the Mughals, V.S. Bendre has stated that it was the conflict and antagonism - Antastha Kalah - (Internal Quarrel) - of the ministers of Shivaji against Sambhaji, and in it the support of Shivaji to the ministers that led Sambhaji to desert to Aurangzeb.[74]

---

74. Bendre-Sambhaji, Pp.64-66; 73-74; 92-121.

In the extant historical sources for the history of Sambhaji it is the Bakre Danapatra of Sambhaji of 24th August, 1680, and the Paramanandakavya of the court poet of Sambhaji, which tell us that the ministers of Shivaji were antagonistic towards Sambhaji.

Out of these sources, V.S. Bendre has used the contents of the Bakre Danapatra in one of his articles[75] which he has written earlier to his work on Sambhaji. He has not taken into account that Danapatra in his work on Sambhaji.

In his Bakre Danapatra of 24th August, 1680, Chhatrapati Sambhaji has stated that the "ministers of Shivaji were antagonistic towards him".[76] Since V.S. Bendre has not taken the Bakre Danapatra in his work on Sambhaji, he could not ponder over the question as to why Sambhaji has called the ministers of Shivaji as "antagonistic" towards him when in his Budhabhushana which was written by him at Shringarpur before 13th December, 1678, Sambhaji has called the ministers of Shivaji as "honest".[77]

The answer of this question is very clear. The data of the Budhabhushana proves that Sambhaji regarded the ministers of Shivaji as "honest" because they were

---

75. Bendre,V.S., Yesubai, Shahu Va Rajaram Yanchetil Snehasambandha-Lekhankaj (Navakal, Marathi Daily, Bombay, dated 10th June, 1927, p.2.)
76. Bakre Danapatra, p.433.
77. Budhabhushana - Velankar, Verse 14, p.2.

not against him in any way till the time he deserted to the Mughals (13th December, 1678). Those very 'honest' ministers were regarded by Sambhaji as "antagonistic" towards him in his Bakre Danapatra of 24th August, 1680, because after Sambhaji's desertion to the Mughals they had hated him as he had conducted anti-Svarajya activities till the time of his return to the Svarajya, and after the death of Shivaji by side tracting Sambhaji's hereditary claim to his throne, they had tried to set up prince Rajaram as a successor to Shivaji. Therefore, it is clear that what Sambhaji has written in the Bakre Danapatra about the "antagonism" of Shivaji's ministers with him, expresses not the historical truth but his animus against those ministers.

Since V.S. Bendre has not taken into account the Bakre Danapatra of Sambhaji, and the data stated above of the Budhabhushana related to the ministers of Shivaji, he has been led to ascribe credibility unwarrantedly to the things stated by the poet of the Paramanandakavya about the antagonism of the ministers of Shivaji with Sambhaji. V.S. Bendre has not realized that the Paramanandakavya is not an independent source but is a work of the court poet of Sambhaji, in which, as has been shown earlier, the poet has stated the version of the antagonism of the ministers of Shivaji with Sambhaji as has been voiced out by Sambhaji in his Bakre Danapatra,

which is earlier to the period of the composition of the Paramanandakavya. As a result, the version given by V.S. Bendre that it was as a result of the antagonism and internal quarrel (Antastha Kalaha) of the ministers of Shivaji with Sambhaji and the side of the ministers which Shivaji had taken in those matters, was the cause for the desertion of Sambhaji to Aurangzeb cannot be regarded as correct.

Kamal Gokhale, after rejecting the cause given by Chitnis for the desertion of Sambhaji to the Mughals, has regarded that the griha Kalaha (domestic quarrel) in the house of Chhatrapati Shivaji was the cause for the desertion of Sambhaji.[78] She has maintained her view on the basis of the Paramanandakavya and the Shivadigvijaya Bakhar.

As shown earlier, though the veracity of the contents of the Paramanandakavya is doubtful, Kamal Gokhale has accepted as credible the griha Kalaha in the house of Shivaji as narrated in it. This grihakalaha has been narrated by the court poet of Sambhaji in such an ingenious way that it has baffled the historians of the Maratha period upto now. That grihakalaha has been narrated by him as follows.

---

78. Gokhale - Sambhaji, Pp. 50-56, 64.

Queen Soyarabai, the step-mother of Sambhaji, Annaji Datto and other ministers of Shivaji had made an attempt, after the death of Shivaji, to effect the succession of prince Rajaram, the younger son of Shivaji in order to prevent Sambhaji's succession to the throne of the Svarajya. Their attempt was foiled as the brother of Queen Soyarabai and the commander in chief of Shivaji, Hambirrao Mohite took the side of Sambhaji. As he defeated Annaji Datto and others, Sambhaji became the Chhatrapati.

This proved to be an unfortunate event in the Maratha history. For, a person who had deserted the Svarajya earlier had become its master. This event must have caused much agony and frustration to the subjects of the Svarajya. How to live under such a person whose inclinations towards the Svarajya were different than their own must have been a problem before them.

In this atmosphere of frustration, when through military efforts they could not prevent Sambhaji's succession, Annaji Datto and others seem to have implicated Soyarabai in their activity to dislodge Sambhaji from throne by other measures. They tried to poison Sambhaji at Panhala, and in August September, 1681, tried to join hands against Sambhaji with Prince Akbar, the rebel son of Aurangzeb who had come to

Sambhaji for shelter.[79] But their plots proved unsuccessful and for the crime of treason, Sambhaji put Annaji Datto and others to death. As Soyarabai did not want to live a shameful life in the future, she committed suicide.[80]

Instead of telling us about the real motive of Annaji Datto and Soyarabai to work against Sambhaji, the poet of the Paramanandakavya has ascribed to them some other motive. That is, he has shown in his work that Soyarabai, who was the step-mother of Sambhaji, was against him as she wished that instead of him, her son Rajaram should become a king after Shivaji. The poet has narrated her activity according to this wish prior to the Karnataka expedition of Shivaji (October, 1676).[81]

Kamal Gokhale has accepted this as credible because this fact is given by a contemporary and it is according to the human nature found in the relation of a step-mother and her step-son.[82]

Kamal Gokhale's contention is not sound as in the world at times the step-sons are found to be acting against their step-mothers even when the step-mothers are good towards them. In that, barring the incredible sources like the Bakre Danapatra of Sambhaji and the Shivadigvijaya Bakhar

---

79. Jedhe Shakavali, p.31; Bendre-Sambhaji, Pp.190-194; Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.90.
80. Bendre-Sambhaji, p.141.
81. Paramanandakavya, Section III, Canto VI, Verses 1-52, Pp.56-60; Canto VII, Verses 1-109, Pp.60-68.
82. Gokhale-Sambhaji, Pp.51-56.

it is not found that Soyarabai, Annaji Datto and others had acted against Sambhaji before his desertion to Aurangzeb. If they acted against Sambhaji after his desertion to Aurangzeb, it was a natural consequence of their contempt for Sambhaji's evil actions.

Even the poet of the Paramanandakavya is found to be knowing that Sambhaji's desertion to Aurangzeb and his subsequent attack on Svarajya were 'evil acts'. For, in his work[83] he has stated that a 'wise person' asked him as to why did Sambhaji perform the 'evil acts' of deserting to Aurangzeb and of conquering Bhupalgad of the Svarajya with the help of Mughal general Dilerkhan?

If the court poet of Sambhaji knew that the activities of Sambhaji to desert to Aurangzeb and to conquer Bhupalgad were "evil", why do we not find him condemning Sambhaji but find him constructing a fabricated story of quarrel and antagonism of Soyarabai, Annaji Datto and others with Sambhaji earlier to his desertion to Aurangzeb ? A clue to know that answer is offered by the Bakre Danapatra of Sambhaji in which he has stated about his desertion to Aurangzeb.

The Bakre Danapatra is an official document of Sambhaji given to a priest who was the son of Namdev Bhatta Bakre of the sacred place, Parashuram (in Konkan).

---

83. Paramanandakavya, Section III, Canto XIII, Verses 1-3, p.96.

It is issued by Sambhaji on 24th August, 1680, after becoming the Chhatrapati. In it, Sambhaji has stated that the ministers of Shivaji were antagonistic towards him. They poisoned the mind of Soyarabai by saying that the eldest son of Shivaji (Sambhaji) should not be allowed to inherit the kingdom of Shivaji. Due to the partiality of Shivaji towards Soyarabai, Shivaji's opinion became against him (Sambhaji). Therefore, he abandoned the Svarajya and in collusion with Mughal general Dilerkhan, attacked and conquered Bhupalgad of the Svarajya.[84]

When the blemish ascribed by Sambhaji to Shivaji is put to a test, we do not get any proof for it from the extant sources other than the Paramanandakavya and the Shivadigvijaya Bakhar. There is no credible proof available to show that the ministers of Shivaji had poisoned the mind of Soyarabai; Soyarabai had instigated Shivaji against Sambhaji; and due to his partiality towards her, Shivaji had done any injustice to Sambhaji.

It becomes clear then, that if in the Paramanandakavya we find that narration of the Griha Kalaha in the house of Shivaji, it is because of the writing of Sambhaji about it in the Bakre Danapatra. The court poet who is the author of the happenings in the life of Sambhaji in the Paramanandakavya being under the obligations of Sambhaji,

---

84. Bakre Danapatra, Pp.432-434.

had naturally preferred to voice out what his master had said about it.[85] This leads us to reject the credence of the Paramanandakavya about the Grihakalaha in the house of Shivaji.

The Shivadigvijaya Bakhar is another source in which an echo of the Griha kalaha is voiced. It is written in 1818 A.D.[86] Moreover, it is a source having in it such fictitious statements that Soyarabai poisoned Shivaji and caused his death for obtaining his kingdom for her son Rajaram.[87] This appears to be improbable and absurd as to poison Shivaji was not to her advantage. He was the only person who could save her from the evil inclinations of Sambhaji after his return from the Mughal camp.[88] As it is, her brother and the commander in chief(Senapati) of Shivaji, Hambirrao Mohite was a supporter of Sambhaji. Those were the days when rule was possible with the help of the support of the military. Due to this, if she wanted to poison Shivaji, she would certainly have secured the support of Hambirrao.[89] The fact that Hambirrao supported Sambhaji against Soyarabai; and the absurd surrounding in which the death of Shivaji is

---

85. Joshi,P.S.,Yuvaraj Sambhaji Ani Mogal-Eka Kuta Prashna, (BISMQ, LI, No.1-4,p.88).
86. Herwadkar, R.V., Marathi Bakhar, Pp.70-72.
87. Shivadigvijaya Bakhar, Pp.458-467.
88. Joshi,P.S., Yuvaraj Sambhaji Ani Mogal-Eka Kuta Prashna, (BISMQ LI, Nos.1-4,p.88).
89. Bendre- Sambhaji, p. 147.

painted in the Bakhar, leads us to reject its credence in the Griha kalaha. Moreover, since it is written with the help of earlier sources,[90] it appears that in it material like Griha kalaha in the house of Shivaji from the Paramanandakavya has found a place. This becomes clear when the comparison of the description of the assault of Sambhaji on Bhupalgad given in the Paramanandakavya[91] is made with the description given of it in the Shivadigvijaya Bakhar[92] and the similarities in them are noted.

From the above discussion it is clear that neither the Paramanandakavya nor the Shivadigvijaya Bakhar is an independent source of the Bakre Danapatra of Sambhaji. The source for the material found in the Paramanandakavya and the Shivadigvijaya Bakhar is the Bakre Danapatra of Sambhaji only.

Since V.S. Bendre and Kamal Gokhale have not realised this, they have been led to construct the unsound versions respectively of Antastha Kalaha and the Griha Kalaha in their works on Sambhaji in order to give the cause for the desertion of Sambhaji to the Mughals.

After rejecting the incredible evidence about the Antastha-Kalaha and the Griha-Kalaha from the Bakre Danapatra of Sambhaji, the Paramanandakavya and the

---

90. Herwadkar,R.V., Marathi Bakhar, Pp.70-72.
91. Paramanandakavya, Section III, Canto 13,Verses 4-60, Pp.96-100.
92. Shivadigvijaya Bakhar, Pp.265-268.

Shivadigvijaya Bakhar, if we take into account the data given in the Sabhasad Bakhar of Shivaji a new light is thrown on the desertion of Sambhaji to Aurangzeb.

After Sambhaji's return to Svarajya from the Mughal camp, Shivaji met him at fort Panhala and said to him "Son, do not desert me ... with great efforts I have brought you back from Aurangzeb... You are my eldest son, who has grown in age and I have understood that you want an independent kingdom...For this, I give you one kingdom (of Karnataka)..."[93]

As has been shown earlier, this writing of Sabhasad is credible since it is corroborated by the Paramanandakavya which states that Sambhaji had asked for a share from Shivaji in the Svarajya[94] before Shivaji went on the Karnataka expedition in October, 1676.

It is clear from the above that the cause of Sambhaji's desertion to the Mughals was his immature and irrational political inclination to become a king in the life time of Shivaji itself after obtaining his share in the territory of the Svarajya. After Shivaji declined to grant the demand of Sambhaji, Sambhaji by conducting mischievous anti-Shivaji activities at Shringarpur with discontentment, deserted to the Mughals on 13th December, 1678, as shown earlier. As a result of

---

93. Sabhasad-Shivaji Bakhar, p.93.
94. Paramanandakavya, Section III, Canto VII, Verses 78-79, p.65.

these matters V.S. Bendre's contention that "Sambhaji, instead of tolerating insults and neglect, sacrificed his rights of a Yuvaraj and went in search of an honourable life (to the Mughals)"[95] does not appear to be sound. For by going over to the enemies of one's State one cannot live an honourable life.

Dilerkhan was thrown into transports of joy at the desertion of Shivaji's heir to his side. He felt happy as if he had conquered the Deccan. He beat his drums of joy and sent a report to Aurangzeb about the desertion of Sambhaji to the Mughal camp. Sambhaji was created a seven - Hazari Mansabdar and a Raja and presented with an elephant by Aurangzeb.[96]

As he had entered in the Mughal service, Sambhaji was required to help the Mughals to conquer the forts and the territory of the Svarajya. In fact, he had deserted to the Mughals for that very purpose as is clear from his message which he had sent to Shivaji at the time of his joining over to the Mughals that "he will come back to conquer the Sahyadri" (Svarajya).[97]

Dilerkhan with his valuable new ally, Sambhaji, halted at Akluj (50 miles south of Bahadurgad) for some

---

95. Bendre - Sambhaji, p.77.
96. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha - Pagadi, p.71; Sarkar - Aurangzib IV, Pp. 222-223.
97. Paramanandakavya, Section III, Canto X, Verses 54-55, Pp.83-84.

time. Then in collusion with Dilerkhan, Sambhaji marched to the fort of Bhupalgad[98] (20 miles north west of Jath and 45 miles south-west of Pandharpur), situated among the Majre (Manjra) hills, which Shivaji had built as a store-house of his property and the refuge of the families of his subjects in the neighbourhood during his wars with the Mughals.[99]

From the Paramanandakavya we get the information that Sambhaji sent his messenger to Firangoji Narasala, the Maratha commander, who was in charge of Bhupalgad, and asked him to hand over that fortress to the Mughals.[100] But Firangoji Narasala, who was a loyal officer of the Svarajya, did not pay any heed to the message of Sambhaji, who had become an enemy of the Svarajya. Due to it Sambhaji became enraged and leading an assault on Bhupalgad[101] with the help of the Mughal army, carried out the slaughter of many soldiers of the Svarajya who tried to defend that fort. Dilerkhan, after the conquest of Bhupalgad, captured vast quantities of grain and other property and large numbers of people from that fort. Seven hundred survivors of the garrison were deprived of one hand and then set free: the other captives were

---

98. Bakre Danapatra, p.433.
99. Sarkar - Aurangzib IV, Pp.283-284.
100. Paramanandakavya, Section III, Canto XIII, Verses 4-24, Pp. 96-97; Shivadigvijaya Bakhar, p.267.
101. Shivadigvijaya Bakhar, p.267.

evidently sold into slavery.[102] After conquering Bhupalgad on 17th April, 1679, Dilerkhan burnt everything that he could not carry off from it and dismantling its fortifications, returned to Dhulkhed.[103]

For his desertion to the Mughals and his attack on the Bhupalgad and its defenders, Sambhaji would always stand in history as a condemnable person.[104] Those actions of Sambhaji prove that he was a person of irrational character.

It seems that after the conquest of Bhupalgad, Sambhaji, with the help of the Mughal army laid a siege to fort Panhala of the Svarajya in May, 1679.[105] The contention of V.S. Bendre[106] and of Kamal Gokhale[107] that fort Panhala was not in reality besieged (by Sambhaji) is not correct as the references of the English records of 29th July, 1679, which they have given for their contention, betray it. For, those references of English records[108] clearly state that "Dilerkhan and

---

102. Sarkar-Aurangzib IV, p.224; Busatinussalatin-Parasnis-Bendre, p.534.
103. Sarkar-Ibid. p.225; Jedhe Shakavali, p.29; Tarikh-i-Dilkusha-Pagadi, p.71; Busatinussalatin-Parasnis-Bendre, p.534; Sardesai-Shivaji, p.203. Apte, D.V., Shivaji Maharajanchi Khari Janmatithi, (Shivacharitra Pradip, p.268) has given the correct date of the conquest of Bhupalgad by the Mughals. It is based on the Shivapur Daftaratil Yadi, p.53.
104. Potdar, D.V., Ashirvad, (Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.5).
105. Sen-ERS-II, No.360, p.196.
106. Bendre - Sambhaji, Pp.80-81.
107. Gokhale - Sambhaji, Pp.66-67.
108. Sen-ERS-II, No.362, Pp.197-198; SPSS-II, No.2116, p.634; Kale-Shivaji, p.223.

Sambhaji have obliged the Vijapur Vazirs to join with them against Shivaji when the rains are over, and great preparations are making on both sides for an encounter under Panhala".

V.S. Bendre has tried to strengthen his contention that Sambhaji does not seem to have besieged fort Panhala with the help of his surmise that "probably in May,1679, Sambhaji might have gone to Aurangbad (to meet Shah Alam, son of Aurangzeb, who was the Subhedar of Deccan at that time), and in May-June, 1678, the marriage of Sambhaji might have taken place at Surat with Champa, the daughter of Tapikant, a resident of Maheshwar.

This surmise of V.S. Bendre about the marriage of Sambhaji with the daughter of Tapikant is based upon the Shambhuraj Charitam, or Haihayendracharita, a Sanskrit poetic work which is written by Hari Kavi in 1685 A.D.[109]

The name of the patron and hero of this poetic work being Sambhu, V.S. Bendre has been misled to regard him as Sambhaji, the son of Chhatrapati Shivaji. That the Shambhuraj Charitam or the Haihayendra Charita relates the story of the marriage of Shambhudas Desai and that there is nothing in it, which can be connected with Sambhaji, the son of Chhatrapati Shivaji, has been

---

109. Bendre-Sambhaji, Pp.81-86; Kulkarni,B.R., Chhatrapati Sambhaji, Shambhudas Desai Ani Champa, (Navabharat (Monthly), XIV, No.9, p.15).

conclusively pointed out by B.R. Kulkarni.[110] Therefore, the surmise of V.S. Bendre about the marriage of Sambhaji with Champa cannot be accepted.

After the fall of Bhupalgad, there started a period of puzzling intrigue and counter-intrigue between Dilerkhan and the nobles of the Bijapur court and it brought to an end the friendship between the Mughals and the Bijapur state by August, 1679.[111]

This led Dilerkhan to undertake a new campaign against Bijapur on 18th August, 1679. In that circumstance, the Bijapur court entered into an alliance with Chhatrapati Shivaji against the Mughals.[112]

Meanwhile the Mughals conquered Mangalvedhe from Saidkhan of Bijapur[113] and the Mughal general Sujansingh came nearer to Bijapur[114] probably in early September, 1679. Siddi Masaud, the Vazir of Bijapur, then sent Sabaji Ghatge with the army of Hurgal to Indi (28miles north of Bijapur). This detachment check-mated Sambhaji, who was out foraging. In the skirmish, though Sabaji was wounded, he defeated Sambhaji.[115]

Therefore, on 15th September, 1679, Dilerkhan left his camp at Dhulkhed and came very close to Bijapur by

---

110. Ibid., Pp.13-16.
111. Sarkar-Aurangzib IV, p.225; Busatinussalatin-Parasnis-Bendre, Pp. 535-548.
112. Sarkar-Shivaji and His Times, Pp.323-324; Busatinussalatin-Parasnis-Bendre, Pp.551-552; Jedhe Shakavali, p.30.
113. Busatinussalatin-Parasnis-Bendre, p.553.
114. Sarkar- Shivaji and His Times, p.324.
115. Busatinussalatin-Parasnis-Bendre, p.554.

7th October, 1679. When his negotiations were going on with Bijapur, Shivaji arrived at Selgur, midway between Panhala and Bijapur with ten thousand cavalry. On 4th November, 1679, Shivaji devided his army between himself and Anandarao. Shivaji with the troops under him started by the road of Muslah and Almala, and sent Anandarao by way of the river Man and Sangola, to raid the Mughal territories in order to effect the diversion of Dilerkhan from Bijapur.[116]

But Dilerkhan, to whom the capture of Bijapur seemed easy, paid no heed to the Maratha plunder and devastation of the Mughal provinces as he hoped for the highest rewards from the expected conquest of Bijapur. Therefore, he pressed his attack on Bijapur and did not retreat from it as was expected by Shivaji.[117]

On 14th November, 1679, having realized that his siege of Bijapur was a failure, Dilerkhan marched towards the Miraj-Panhala region in order to draw Shivaji to the Svarajya for defending that territory. The scheme seemed promising, as Sambhaji bragged of his ability to capture forts quickly with his Maratha followers and thus make the progress of the Mughals easy.[118]

---

116. Sarkar-Shivaji and His Times, p.325; Busatinussalatin--Parasnis-Bendre, Pp.555-556.
117. Sarkar-Shivaji and His Times, p.325.
118. Ibid., p.326.

It is thus clear that Sambhaji, who had deserted to the Mughals on 13th December, 1678, was not struck by any remorse even after his stay of about one year in the enemy camp; and he continued to act as a tool in the hands of the Mughals against the Svarajya.

Dilerkhan then started the activity of ravaging the territory of Bijapur kingdom. By way of Bahamanhali, Maknapur and Jalgiri, he reached Tikota (13 miles west of Bijapur), which was a rich and populous town. In it the wealthy men of the neighbourhood had taken refuge with their families.

As the dwellers of that town had not expected the Mughal attack, they were overwhelmed by the Mughal troops under Ikhlaskhan, who were Vangards of Dilerkhan. When they plundered Tikota, the wives of the Hindus and Muslims with their children jumped into the wells near their houses and committed suicide. The town of Tikota was utterly sacked by them. Nearly 3000 men, both Hindus and Muslims, of Tikota were taken prisoners (for being sold as slaves) by the Mughals.[119]

After the sack of Tikota on 18th November, 1679, the Mughal army under Dilerkhan reached Athani (45 miles West of Bijapur) by way of Honvad and Telang, ravaging the country and carrying off the people as slaves.[120] In

---

119. Busatinussalatin-Parasnis-Bendre, p.559; Sarkar - Shivaji and His Times, p.326.
120. Busatinussalatin-Parasnis-Bendre, p.559.

this activity, Dilerkhan burnt down the town of Athani and proposed to sell the inhabitants who were all Hindus. Sambhaji, who was with Dilerkhan objected to it, but was overruled. As a result, Sambhaji felt disgust about his association with the Mughals.[121] Therefore, when Dilerkhan left Athani for Ainapur, on the night of 20th November, 1679, Sambhaji slipped out of the Mughal camp and fled away to Bijapur.[122] That Sambhaji realized that in the Mughal camp the things will not be of his views is also stated by Shivaji in his letter to Vyankoji.[123]

For the running away of Sambhaji from the camp of Dilerkhan a different cause than the above is stated in the Sabhasad Bakhar of Shivaji.

According to Sabhasad, Aurangzeb wanted to keep Sambhaji in prison. Therefore, he wrote to Dilerkhan to send Sambhaji to him at Delhi.[124] Sabhasad further tells us that because Dilerkhan gave a hint (of Aurangzeb's evil intention) to Sambhaji, Sambhaji fled from the Mughal camp.[125]

---

121. Ibid.; SPSS-II, No.2142,p.642.
122. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha-Pagadi, p.73; Busatinussalatin--Parasnis-Bendre, p.559; Sarkar-Shivaji and His Times, Pp.326-327.
123. SPSS-II, No.2236, p.684.
124. Sabhasad-Shivaji Bakhar, p.93; Sarkar's contention that'Aurangzeb wrote to Diler to arrest Shambhu and send him a prisoner to Delhi'(Shivaji and His Times, p.327,F.N.) is not communicated by the Sabhasad's Bakhar of Shivaji.
125. Sabhasad- Ibid.

As Dilerkhan was an avowed enemy of the Marathas and the Svarajya, it does not appear that he might have given a hint to Sambhaji to flee from the Mughal camp. It seems probable that Sambhaji might have got an inkling from some-one else than Dilerkhan about the evil design of Aurangzeb, and since Shivaji was persuading him to return to Svarajya,[126] Sambhaji seems to have siezed that opportunity to flee from the Mughal camp.

Malhar Ramrao Chitnis' Bakhar of Shivaji[127] and the Busatinussalatin[128] tell us that Sambhaji slipped out of the Mughal camp at Athani with his wife disguised in male attire and rode hard to Bijapur. Since these sources have not mentioned the name of the wife of Sambhaji, we cannot accept the view of J. Sarkar[129] and G.S. Sardesai[130] that she was Yesubai. As shown earlier, V.S. Bendre's surmise that Sambhaji married Champa when he was in the Mughal camp is without any foundations. Therefore, we cannot accept his contention that from the Mughal camp at Athani, the wife of Sambhaji who escaped with him was Champa.[131]

---

126. Busatinussalatin-Parasnis-Bendre, p.560; SPSS-II,No.2236, p.684. In his letter to Vyankoji, Shivaji has stated that he exerted much to bring back Sambhaji from the Mughal camp. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha-Pahadi,p.73.
127. Chitnis-Shivaji Bakhar, Pp.237-238.
128. Busatinussalatin-Parasnis-Bendre, p.560.
129. Sarkar-Shivaji and His Times, p.327.
130. Sardesai-Shivaji, p.205.
131. Bendre,V.S., Sambhajichya Charitratil Kahi Samasya, (BIAS V, No.19,Pp.83-84); Bendre-Sambhaji,Pp.89-90. Sambhaji-II, p.70.

Sambhaji was warmly received by Masaud, the Vazir of Bijapur kingdom, at Bijapur. Dilerkhan, on learning of Sambhaji's flight, sent an agent, Khwaja Abdul Razzak to Bijapur to bribe Massaud to capture Sambhaji. Sambhaji, on getting the scent of the matter, issued in secret from Bijapur, met a body of cavalry sent by Shivaji to escort him, and galloped away to Panhala, which he reached on 21st December, 1679.[132]

---

132. Busatinussalatin - Parasnis-Bendre, p.560; Sambhaji-Shakavali, p.101; Bendre-Sambhaji, p. 90, F.N.2.

Chapter V

SAMBHAJI'S TRIUMPH OVER THE OPPONENTS

After the return of Sambhaji from the Mughal camp to fort Panhala, Chhatrapati Shivaji met him on 13th January, 1680.[1]

Shivaji said to Sambhaji, "Son, do not desert me. Aurangzeb has enmity with us. He wanted to deceive you. By the grace of God, I have effected your deliverance (from Aurangzeb). You are my eldest son who has grown in age and I have understood that you want an independent kingdom. Due to it I also certainly want to give you one kingdom. I have two sons. The one is yourself, and the other one is Rajaram. I have one kingdom. I divide it into two parts. One is the kingdom of Jinji, whose boundary is from river Tungabhadra to river Kaveri. The second one is earlier to the banks of river Godavari. Thus, there are two kingdoms. You are my eldest son; I have given you the kingdom of Karnataka. I give the kingdom in Maharashtra to Rajaram. You, both my sons, rule over these kingdoms. I will make good of my later life by devoting myself in the worship of God." After hearing these words Sambhaji replied to him ' I have your feet' (i.e. I will remain at your feet). ' I will eat rice and milk and keep remembering your feet'(i.e. I will stay with you in obedience with whatever you will give me). Listening this Shivaji got satisfied.[2]

---

1. Sambhaji Shakavali, p.101; SPSS-II, No.2236,p.684.
2. Sabhasad-Shivaji Bakhar, p.93.

From this talk between Chhatrapati Shivaji and Sambhaji, it becomes clear that Shivaji had felt much disgust and agony about the desire of Sambhaji to have a kingdom during the life-time of Shivaji itself. Shivaji, after seeing the futile and wayward activities which Sambhaji had conducted to get his ideal realized; talked with him in disgust and with taunts about the grant of a kingdom to Sambhaji, just as in the ordinary course of life every father talks to his son when the father feels disgust and agony over the irrational conduct performed by the son to get realized his whimsical idea. This is proved when we take into account that Chhatrapati Shivaji, who had reached the zenith of his successful political career, talked to Sambhaji about his retirement from the matters of his government and of spending his remaining life in the worship of God after dividing his kingdom between his two sons.

That talk also gives us the information that Sambhaji, who understood the gesture of agony, disgust and taunts of Shivaji, meekly agreed to stay with Shivaji and remain in obedience to him. Seeing that Sambhaji had become meek; he had no idea to have a separate kingdom at that time, and was prepared to stay with him in obedience, Chhatrapati Shivaji got satisfied.

Writing about this talk between Chhatrapati Shivaji and Sambhaji G.S. Sardesai[3] has stated that "though

---

3. Sardesai - Shivaji, p.205.

Shivaji tried to effect reconciliation with Sambhaji and told him matters of wisdom; those things had no effect on Sambhaji. As a result, Shivaji became much unhappy and that made his health decline".

It seems that G.S. Sardesai has not taken into account the words "Listening this" (reply of Sambhaji to what Shivaji had said about the division of his kingdom into two kingdoms), "Shivaji got satisfied", which Sabhasad has written while narrating the result of the talk between Shivaji and Sambhaji. We feel that had Sambhaji persisted at that time to have a share from Shivaji's kingdom (a separate kingdom for himself); Shivaji had no reason to become happy over the outcome of his talk with Sambhaji at Panhala. It is seen from the details of that talk reported by Sabhasad that even though Shivaji had apparently shown his preparedness to give a kingdom as was earlier desired by Sambhaji; Sambhaji, who properly understood the feelings of agony and disgust of Shivaji about his irrational actions, showed his readiness to remain in obedience to Shivaji and he did not show preparedness to have a kingdom from Shivaji at that time. Probably seeing that Sambhaji had at least, at that time, come to his senses it was, that Shivaji became happy over the outcome of his talk with Sambhaji. Due to this the version of G.S. Sardesai that "though Shivaji tried to effect reconciliation with

Sambhaji and told him matters of wisdom; those things had no effect on Sambhaji. As a result, Shivaji became much unhappy and that made his health decline" is not correct. Similarly, the version of J. Sarkar[4] about the talk between Shivaji and Sambhaji which runs on similar lines is also not correct. We also cannot agree with the contention of T.S. Shejwalkar[5] that Shivaji had shown readiness to grant the kingdom of Jinji to Sambhaji; and Sambhaji had refused to have it. T.S. Shejwalkar seems to have not taken into account the nature of that talk which Shivaji had conducted in agony and disgust with Sambhaji. If we take into account the nature of that talk, we cannot say that Shivaji had in reality offered the kingdom of Jinji to Sambhaji.

After when Sambhaji agreed to remain at his feet and in obedience to him, Chhatrapati Shivaji told him as to what was the treasury of the Svarajya; its revenue returns; its forts and the number of different troops etc., he had[6]. Shivaji then gave the territory of Prant Panhala for the expenses of Sambhaji[7] and to carry out out its work kept Janardan Narayan Sarkarkun, Sonaji Naik Banki and Babaji Dhamdhere at Panhala with Sambhaji.[8]

---

4. Sarkar-Shivaji, Pp.330-331.
5. Shejwalkar, T.S.,- Paramanandaputrakrita Anupurana Kavyachen Parikshana, (Shiv Chhatrapati, p.138).
6. Sabhasad - Shivaji Bakhar, Pp.94-106.
7. Chitnis - Shivaji Bakhar, p.238.
8. Sabhasad - Shivaji Bakhar, p.106.

Causing the contentment of Sambhaji, Shivaji told him that " I am going to Raigad. I will come back after performing the marriage of my younger son, Rajaram. Then we will think about the state affairs which need to be decided. You are my eldest son. By all means, I have confidence about you." Saying this, Chhatrapati Shivaji went to Raigad.[9]

It is interesting to note that with him Chhatrapati Shivaji did not take Sambhaji to Raigad for the marriage of prince Rajaram. As it is, prince Rajaram being the youngest son of Shivaji, after his marriage, there was not to be again a marriage of a son in the house of Shivaji. Moreover Rajaram's marriage had a great significance as it was taking place after Shivaji had coronated himself as a King in 1674. At the time of that joyous occasion in the house of Chhatrapati Shivaji, all the prominent persons who had spared no pains in assisting Shivaji to found the Svarajya were to remain present at Raigad. It, therefore, would have been befitting had Sambhaji attended the function of the marriage of prince Rajaram at Raigad.

Writing about the mysterious absence of Sambhaji for the marriage of prince Rajaram at Raigad, it is contended by some historians[10] that it was because of the desire

---

9. Ibid., p.106.
10. Gokhale - Sambhaji, Pp.70-71.

of Shivaji to keep away Sambhaji from Soyarabai. By that, it appears that they impliedly want to suggest that it was the step-motherly attitude of Soyarabai towards Sambhaji which led Shivaji not to take Sambhaji with him when he went to Raigad to perform the marriage of Rajaram.

We cannot accept this version because there does not exist any credible historical evidence to prove that at any time Soyarabai had shown step-motherly attitude towards Sambhaji. What can be said about Soyarabai's opposition to Sambhaji after his return from the Mughal camp is that she became against his succession to Shivaji's throne not because he was her step-son, but because he had conducted anti-Svarajya activities by joining the Mughals. Soyarabai, being the Chief Queen of Shivaji who cared for the preservation of the sanctity of the throne of Shivaji (in fact it was her duty as the Chief Queen of the Svarajya), if stood in opposition to Sambhaji's succession to the throne of Shivaji in future, her opposition to Sambhaji is fully justified. Those historians have not taken into account this duty which Soyarabai was required to render to the Svarajya by way of her position as the Chief Queen; and have mixed up her opposition to Sambhaji with the imaginary step-motherly relations she had with Sambhaji. It is, therefore, likely that Sambhaji, who had a blot on his character because of his commission of the anti-Svarajya activities, must have become a problem before Shivaji. It seems that Shivaji must have felt it inconvenient to take with him at Raigad Sambhaji, who had earlier not only

betrayed the Svarajya but had by his attack on Bhupalgad, fought against and killed the defenders of Svarajya.[11]

It seems that Shivaji, together with granting the territory of Prant Panhala for the expenses of Sambhaji, had also delegated to him the work of its administration. This is proved by the fact that on the very day (13th January, 1680) on which Chhatrapati Shivaji met Sambhaji at Panhala; Sambhaji, to show courtesy to the Frenchmen, whose ships of the French company had anchored in the port of Rajapur, sent some Maratha sailors. Sambhaji also proved to those Frenchmen the esteem which he had for the French company.[12]

This disproves the version given by Malhar Ramrao Chitnis[13] and G.S. Sardesai[14] that Shivaji had kept

---

11. Joshi, P.S., The Riddle of the Desertion of Yuvaraj Sambhaji to Aurangzeb, (Seminar on Maratha History, University of Bombay, 1971, p.9.(Unpublished). Bendre, V.S., Sambhaji Maharajanchya Charitratil Anirnit Samasya, (BIAS, V No.19, Pp.77-83), Bendre-Sambhaji, II, Pp.105-110, tries to prove that it was because Sambhaji was sent by Shivaji on the Jalna expedition that Sambhaji could not be present for the marriage of Rajaram. Shri.Setu Madhavrao Pagadi has suggested to me in a discussion that the Jalna expedition which is given as a cause for the absence of Sambhaji for the marriage of Rajaram is a figment of imagination of some historians. This is because the account of Khafikhan of that expedition on which they have relied is not of the Jalna expedition of March, 1680, but is of the Jalna expedition of a later period. I am grateful to Shri.Pagadi for the suggestion.
12. Sarkar, J., Contemporary French Accounts of Shivaji, (BISMQ III, Nos 2/3/4, p.107); Bendre-Maharastretihasachi Sadhane II, No.148, p.176.
13. Chitnis-Shivaji Bakhar, p.238.
14. Sardesai-Shivaji, p.206.

Sambhaji under surveillance at fort Panhala when Shivaji went to Raigad after meeting Sambhaji to perform the marriage of Rajaram. This also leads us to set aside the view expressed by J. Grant Duff[15] that Shivaji had kept Sambhaji under confinement.

Chhatrapati Shivaji, who had gone to Raigad, performed the marriage of prince Rajaram with the daughter of Senapati Prataprao Gujar in great pomp and joy on 15th March, 1680. The wife of Rajaram was named as Janakibai.[16] The atmosphere of joy in the house of Shivaji came to an end when he became ill due to fever on 24th March, 1680, and expired unexpectedly on 3rd April, 1680.[17] The sudden death of Chhatrapati Shivaji brought to the fore the issue about his successor in the Svarajya. Then the ministers of Shivaji brought Rajaram on his throne on 21st April, 1680, by performing his Manchakarohana ceremony.

What reasons must have led the ministers of Shivaji to bring on his throne his younger son Rajaram as his successor cannot be understood by us clearly as positive data to that effect is not available in the extant historical

---

15. HM-I, p. 237.
16. Sabhasad-Shivaji Bakhar, p.106; Chitnis-Shivaji Bakhar, p.246; Jedhe Shakavali, p.30.
17. Joshi, S.N., Kalapat, (Sabhasad-Shivaji Bakhar, p.175); Sarkar-Shivaji and His Times, p.331; Jedhe Shakavali, p.30; Wakaskar-91 Kalami Bakhar, p.56.

sources of that period. But taking into account the anti-Svarajya activities of Sambhaji, and the fact that Shivaji had avoided taking him to Raigad for the marriage of prince Rajaram, it could be that after the return of Sambhaji from the Mughal camp, the persons in the Svarajya must have felt disturbed. It is possible that when the dignitaries of the Svarajya, who must have attended in large number the marriage of Rajaram at Raigad; they might have raised before Shivaji a legitimate doubt about the worthiness of Sambhaji to succeed him. It is possible that Queen Soyarabai, who owed a duty to the Svarajya by way of her constitutional position as the chief Queen of Shivaji, to maintain and preserve the dignity and purity of its throne, might have also raised her voice in opposition to Sambhaji's succession to that throne after Shivaji. It is also probable that the ministers of Shivaji, might have supported the view of Queen Soyarabai that Sambhaji should not be allowed to succeed Shivaji.

The funeral ceremony of Chhatrapati Shivaji was performed at Raigad by Rajaram when the queens and servants suggested to that effect.[18] The news of the death of Shivaji was not communicated to Sambhaji by

---

18. Sabhasad - Shivaji Bakhar, Pp.109-110.

the people at Raigad before the funeral of Shivaji took place.[19]

These facts suggest some clues to know as to what situation must have prevailed at Raigad immediately after the death of Shivaji.

It seems that due to the unexpected and sudden death of Chhatrapati Shivaji, Queen Soyarabai and Pralhad Niraji, the minister of Shivaji, who were present at that time, might have got perplexed. They seem to have decided of not communicating the news of the death of Shivaji to Sambhaji who was at fort Panhala at that time. This they seem to have decided in the light of the talk which they had with Shivaji probably at the time when the marriage of Rajaram had taken place. When the purport of that talk was to be implemented, Queen Soyarabai and Pralhad Niraji seem to have thought of getting it implemented at the hands of Annaji Datto and Moropant Pingle, who had enjoyed the confidence of Shivaji.

Since Annaji Datto and Moropant Pingle were not present at Raigad but were away from it when Chhatrapati Shivaji expired suddenly, Queen Soyarabai and others seem to have closed the doors of Raigad in order to keep secret the news of Shivaji's death with a view that it it should be given to the people after the arrangement

---

19. Chitnis - Sambhaji Bakhar, Pp.1-5.

for his successor was executed. After that, writing letters to Annaji Datto and Moropant Pingle about the death of Shivaji they asked them to come to Raigad. Accordingly, Annaji Datto reached Raigad on the sixth day from the day on which Shivaji had expired.[20]

It seems that since Peshwa Moropant Pingle had not reached Raigad on the sixth day from the death of Shivaji, a problem seems to have cropped up before Queen Soyarabai and Annaji Datto about the installation of prince Rajaram and not Sambhaji as his successor on the throne of the Svarajya. Since that matter was such that it set aside the hereditary right of Sambhaji to succeed Shivaji, it seems that Queen Soyarabai and Annaji Datto must have thought it imperative to instal Rajaram on the throne in the presence of Peshwa Moropant Pingle, who by way of his position, was the Chief Minister of the Council of Eight Ministers of Shivaji and who by way of his enjoyment of great trust and confidence of Shivaji was the most important statesman of the Svarajya. Therefore, it seems that in his absence, on the sixth day, as was required by the tradition and custom followed for

---

20. Modak-Chhoti Bakhar, p.49. Bendre-Sambhaji, p.146, is not correct when he sayson the basis of the same source that [redacted] Datto reached Raigad on the eight day of the death of Shivaji. His reading of the source is not correct.

the funeral of a king[21] they performed only the funeral ceremony of Shivaji performed at the hands of prince Rajaram and not at the hands of Sambhaji. This could be because they might have regarded Sambhaji, who had performed a Kuveda for the early death of his father (Shivaji) and who after joining the enemies of the Svarajya had attacked it, as a Patita(a person who had fallen from virtue) who was not entitled to perform the funeral rites of his father (Shivaji) even when he was Shivaji's eldest son.[22] In the similar way they seem to have thought that because Rajaram performed the funeral rites of Shivaji, he and not Sambhaji was to inherit the Svarajya of Shivaji.[23]

The historical evidence shows that Peshwa Moropant Pingle reached Raigad after the funeral of Chhatrapati Shivaji had taken place.[24] It seems that after his arrival at Raigad, Peshwa Moropant Pingle, Annaji Datto, Queen Soyarabai and other statesmen of the Svarajya took the decision on the basis of the purport of the talk they might have had with Shivaji at the time of prince Rajaram's marriage about the successor to his

---

21. Bendre - Sambhaji, p.146.
22. See Bhat,Y.A., Dr. Manekrita Dharmashastracha Itihas (Uttarardha) Pp.58-59.
23. Ibid., Points out that a person who performs the funeral rites of the dead, is entitled to perform his Shraddha and inherit his property.
24. Modak-Chhoti Bakhar, p.49.

throne. It seems clear from this that they had decided to set aside Sambhaji's hereditary claim over the throne of the Svarajya. Knowing well that Sambhaji had become irrationally impatient in the life-time of Shivaji itself to become a king, they seem to have taken steps to put restraints on him at Panhala[25] as he was not expected to forego his eldest son's hereditary right of succession to the throne of Shivaji even though he had conducted anti-Svarajya activities in 1678-1679. After that, Annaji Datto, with the consent of Peshwa Moropant Pingle and other statesmen, performed the Manchakarohana ceremony of prince Rajaram on 21st April, 1680,[26] when the period of mourning of the death of Shivaji was over.

Some historians have not taken into account the various considerations which emerge out of the data which is available of the Manchakarohana ceremony of prince Rajaram after the death of Shivaji. Therefore, they have been led to regard that the Manchakarohana ceremony of Rajaram performed by Annaji Datto was irregular. They feel that it was not in accordance with the political tradition as Rajaram was not the eldest son of Chhatrapati Shivaji, and as that ceremony of Rajaram was not performed before the funeral of Shivaji took place.[27]

---

25. Chitnis-Sambhaji Bakhar, Pp.4-5; Modak-Chhoti Bakhar, Pp.49-50.
26. Jedhe Shakavali, p.30.
27. For example, See - Bendre - Sambhaji, p.160;153.

For different reasons, this version of the Manchakarohana ceremony of Rajaram cannot accepted as sound.

Firstly, from any point of view, the people of a state would always like to have a person as their ruler whose loyalty to the State is above all doubts. Prince Rajaram was such a person. Therefore, there was nothing wrong on the part of Annaji Datto, Moropant Pingle, Queen Soyarabai and others, to bring him on the throne of the Svarajya even though he was the younger son of Shivaji and thereby deny to Sambhaji, the eldest son of Shivaji, his traditional right to succeed Shivaji as his inclinations towards the Svarajya had become doubtful because of the antagonistic stand he had taken against it in collusion with the Mughals during 1678-1679. It is true that Chhatrapati Shivaji had not declared Sambhaji as an out-law even though after joining the Mughals Sambhaji had conquered for them the Bhupalgad of the Svarajya. In fact, Shivaji brought back Sambhaji to the Svarajya with great efforts. After that Shivaji had also given under him the administration which came under Panhala when Sambhaji had agreed, as is shown earlier, that he did not want a share in the Svarajya (a separate kingdom) and had agreed to remain in obedience at the feet of Shivaji.[28] It cannot be

---

28. Sabhasad - Shivaji Bakhar, p.93.

construed from this that Shivaji had necessarily decided to regard Sambhaji as his successor after his return from the Mughal camp. For, Sambhaji had returned largely because in that camp the matters would not be as he would like to have them[29] and to some extent under the pretext of the persuation made of his by Shivaji. It cannot be said positively that had the Mughal general Dilerkhan been inclined to act on the lines suggested by Sambhaji and had the quarrel between them[30] not taken place, Sambhaji, who, according to some historians, "had gone over to the Mughals in search of an 'honourable' life by sacrificing the right of the Yuvaraj, which had accrued to him by way of his birth (being the eldest son of Shivaji) and by rites and ceremonies (at the time of the Coronation of Shivaji in June, 1674)"[31] would have returned to the Svarajya due to his love for it. It is pertinent to note in this connection that even in the Bakre Danapatra which Sambhaji has issued under his own seal on 24th August, 1680, after becoming the Chhatrapati,[32] Sambhaji has not expressed any sorrow or regret for the antagonistic attack he had conducted on the Bhupalgad of the Svarajya in collusion with the Mughals. On the basis of these facts, it cannot be said that Chhatrapati

---

29. SPSS-II, No.2236, p.684.
30. Bakre Danapatra, p.433; Sen-ERS-II,No.393,p.217.
31. Bendre-Sambhaji, p.77.
32. Bakre Danapatra, Pp. 432-434.

Shivaji who had a reputation of having a discerning eye to judge properly the human character, might have, after Sambhaji's return from the Mughal camp to the Svarajya, ever entertained an idea to bring on his throne Sambhaji, who had during 1678-1679 had used his sword against the Svarajya in collusion with the Mughals and whose only qualification which had remained at that time to become Shivaji's successor was that he happened to be Shivaji's eldest son.

The extant sources do not give us any positive information about the wish of Chhatrapati Shivaji to bring back Sambhaji, who had committed grave offences against the Svarajya and as to what arrangement he was going to make for him in the Svarajya in future.

In view of the fact that Sambhaji was a brave and well-trained person, it might have been the view of Shivaji in bringing him back that his bravery should be used for the benefit of the Svarajya and it should not be allowed to be used, if possible, against it. When we think about as to what arrangement Shivaji was going to make for Sambhaji in the future, it is clear that the fate of Sambhaji to become the Chhatrapati of the Svarajya after Shivaji was sealed becaused of his desertion to the Mughals and his attack on the Svarajya in collusion with them. Since no Indian tradition, legal, moral, religious or political, allows the betrayer of a

State to become its king; it cannot be said that Shivaji might have thought of making Sambhaji a successor to the throne of the Svarajya. In view of these matters it appears that when at Panhala Shivaji met Sambhaji on 13th January, 1680; and Sambhaji, feeling ashamed about the talk of taunts of Shivaji, had shown that he did not wish to have a share in the kingdom of Shivaji and was prepared to remain in obedience at the feet of Shivaji and accept what Shivaji would give him; Shivaji might have probably decided that Sambhaji should play second fiddle to Rajaram in the Svarajya and serve in its administration faithfully. Thus, when Sambhaji had forfeited his right to become a king of the Svarajya after Shivaji, the way had automatically become clear for prince Rajaram to become the successor to the throne of Shivaji. We, therefore, do not agree with the view of the historians when they feel that the Manchakarohana ceremony of Rajaram performed by Annaji Datto and others after side-tracking the 'right' of Sambhaji to succeed Shivaji was irregular simply because Rajaram was the younger son of Shivaji.

In this connection it seems that the view of some historians[33] is governed more by the writing of the poet of the Paramanandakavya that "after performing the

---

33. Bendre - Sambhaji, Pp.68-69.

Kalashabhisheka according to the Tantric cult at Shringarpur on 23rd March, 1678, Sambhaji had proclaimed himself as "Svayampurna" (independent);[34] (and due to that) Sambhaji joined Aurangzeb (against the Svarajya) as an "independent king". (After that) Sambhaji showed his valour and ability in the affairs of the Mughal camp and made his father (Shivaji) to recognise his "capability". (After his return to the Svarajya) Shivaji gave more powers to Sambhaji than before (his desertion to Aurangzeb). That made the ministers of Shivaji (who had been against Sambhaji) lower their crest (in shame)".[35] From this it appears that those historians want to communicate that since Sambhaji had joined Aurangzeb against the Svarajya as an "independent king" and had attacked it, he had not committed any offence against it.

The absurdity of this reasoning which is aimed at absolving Sambhaji from the guilt which he had committed against the Svarajya becomes clear when the term "independent king" employed by the poet of the Paramanandakavya and which is accepted by some historians to indicate the constitutional position of Sambhaji to join the Mughals against the Svarajya and then to attack it and after that to claim a right to

---

34. Paramanandakavya, Section I, Verse 62, p.9.
35. Paramanandakavya, Section III, Canto II, Verses 7-13, Pp.36-37; Bendre-Sambhaji, Pp.152-153.

become the legitimate and constitutional sovereign of the Svarajya as a successor of Shivaji is put to scrutiny.

On 23rd March, 1678, when Sambhaji is purported to have performed his Kalashabhisheka and has secured the so-called position of an "independent king"; Chhatrapati Shivaji was the sovereign of the Svarajya, and he was recognised by other political states in India. When it is a fact that in a sovereign state there exists only one ruler and not many rulers, it is tantamount according to the principles of political theory to regard that Sambhaji existed as an independent ruler in the Svarajya when there already existed Chhatrapati Shivaji as its king. It is improper to think, when Sambhaji did not possess any territory, treasury, ministers, army, forts, allies and the subjects, that he was an "independent king" in the Svarajya, even though he might have himself very well performed the Kalashabhisheka privately and in the company of his small coterie of friends of the Shakti cult. In the political life of a state such antics are of no value. In that, no value can be attached in scientific analysis to its version given by the poet of the Paramanandakavya, whose hall-mark is irrationality in sensible matters, when he proudly tells us that the 'independent king' Sambhaji, joined the enemies of his

own state (Mughals) and helped them to conquer it from Shivaji, especially when that poet knew that those actions of Sambhaji were "evil".[36] We, therefore, do not feel that the performance of the Kalashabhisheka by Sambhaji on 23rd March, 1678, at Shringarpur had given him the status of an "independent king", who could at will attack the Svarajya and after that get absolved himself from that guilt performed against the Svarajya. We cannot, therefore, agree with the view of some historians that because Rajaram was the younger son of Shivaji, the performance of his Manchakarohana ceremony by Annaji Datto and others was irregular and improper. In fact when it is established that Sambhaji had forfeited his right to become a worthy successor of Chhatrapati Shivaji; Rajaram, though he was the younger son of Shivaji, was the only rightful heir to the throne of the Svarajya after Shivaji's death.

The other argument of some historians to regard the Manchakarohana ceremony of Rajaram performed by Annaji Datto and others as irregular is that it was not performed before the funeral ceremony of Shivaji took place.

As has been shown earlier, Annaji Datto, who was not present at Raigad at the time of the death of

---

36. Paramanandakavya, Section III, Canto 13, Verses 1-3, p.96.

Shivaji, reached Raigad on the sixth day of Shivaji's death after receiving that sad news.[37] Since Moropant Pingle, the Peshwa of Shivaji, who was at Trimbakeshwar, did not reach Raigad on the sixth day of the death of Shivaji when his funeral took place;[38] Annaji Datto and others seem to have not performed the Manchakarohana ceremony of Rajaram on the day on which the funeral of Shivaji took place. As Peshwa Moropant Pingle was the most important and highest dignitary of the Council of Ministers of Shivaji in whom Shivaji had highest trust, ~~Therefore,~~ Annaji Datto and others were quite correct, if they did not perform the Manchakarohana ceremony of Rajaram before consulting him. Taking into account the immature greed of Sambhaji for political power, to satisfy which he had not hesitated even to join the antagonistic Mughals and attacked the Svarajya earlier; it was quite natural if Annaji Datto prudently waited for Peshwa Moropant Pingle's arrival at Raigad and to secure his willingness and support for the performance of the Manchakarohana ceremony of Rajaram. After the arrival of Moropant Pingle to Raigad, he himself took the lead, and not Annaji Datto, as is incorrectly thought by some historians[39] in planning restraints upon Sambhaji at

---

37. Modak-Chhoti Bakhar, p.49.
38. Ibid.
39. Bendre-Sambhaji, Pp.146; 148-149.

Panhala. It was Moropant Pingle, who communicated others that Rajaram had succeeded to the throne of Shivaji.[40] This proves the contention that because Moropant Pingle was the Peshwa, Annaji Datto had thought it proper and legitimate that Moropant should be given the honour to settle the issue of the successor of Shivaji. This was in tune with the superior position which Moropant Pingle wielded as the Peshwa in the Council of Ministers of Shivaji. Since it was due to these circumstances that Annaji Datto and others could not perform the Manchakarohana ceremony of Rajaram before the funeral ceremony, no credence can be ascribed to the view that it was irregular.

In view of the matters discussed above and in view of the fact which is also accepted by the historians, that Shivaji himself must not have expected that his illness would take a serious turn to cause his sudden death,[41] their contention that had Shivaji decided to deny his kingdom to Sambhaji and grant it to Rajaram; either he himself would have performed the Manchakarohana ceremony of Rajaram or before his funeral, the persons who were present at Raigad at that time would have performed it, cannot be accepted.[42] The inference that because

---

40. Modak-Chhoti Bakhar, Pp.49-50.
41. Bendre-Sambhaji, p.146.
42. Ibid., Pp.153-154.

neither Shivaji nor the persons who were present at Raigad for his funeral had performed the Manchakarohana ceremony of Ranaram, Shivaji had full confidence in the capability of Sambhaji[43] also cannot be accepted as correct.

Though Queen Soyarabai and others, for the proper installation of the successor of Shivaji to the throne of the Svarajya had closed the doors of Raigad in order to keep secret from others the news of his death; Sambhaji seems to have received it through his spies.[44] When Sambhaji came to know that Queen Soyarabai and the Ministers of Chhatrapati Shivaji had decided to bring Rajaram on the throne of the Svarajya and put him (Sambhaji) under arrest; Sambhaji made strict arrangements at Panhala for his own security.[45] Therefore, even though Peshwa Moropant Pingle had written letters to different officers after the Manchakarohana ceremony of Rajaram and had asked them to put Sambhaji under arrest at Panhala;[46] they could not succeed in their mission.

Seeing that Peshwa Moropant Pingle, Annaji Datto, Queen Soyarabai and others, after performing the Manchakarohana ceremony of Rajaram on 21st April,1680,

---

43. Ibid.
44. Chitnis - Sambhaji Bakhar, Pp.4-5.
45. Ibid., p.5.
46. Modak-Chhoti Bakhar,Pp.49-50. Bendre-Sambhaji,p.149, is not correct in saying that it was Annaji Datto who had written those letters.

had declared Rajaram as the successor of Shivaji; Sambhaji seems to have felt hurt. Since he was a person of political ambition, who in the life-time of Chhatrapati Shivaji itself, had yearned to become a king after demanding his share in the Svarajya; Sambhaji, without thinking about the consequences of his rash action on the Svarajya, took the title of the Raja (King) sometime by 27th April, 1680,[47] and set up himself as a parallel ruler. By this stand, Sambhaji created the conditions of a civil war in the Svarajya and posed a problem before the people of the Svarajya to decide as to whom they wanted as their ruler; Sambhaji, who had conducted anti-Svarajya activities, but who was the eldest son of Shivaji; or Rajaram, who was honest but Shivaji's younger son. After setting up himself as a rival ruler Sambhaji also proposed to the Portuguese government in Goa a treaty of peaceful and friendly relations.[48]

It seems that Sambhaji was emboldened to set up himself as a parallel ruler to Rajaram and enter into treaty with the Portuguese government of Goa when he found that by his skilful manoeuvring of the confused political condition of that time he was able to draw support for his cause from Hambirrao Mohite, the

---

47. SPSS-II, No.2251,Pp.688-689; Sen-ERS-II, No.503,p.311.
48. Desai-Portuguese Daftar, Pp.22-25.

Commander-in-Chief of the forces of the Svarajya. We get some idea from the poet of the Paramanandakavya about the skilful manoeuvring done by Sambhaji to exploit the confused political condition in the Svarajya at that time to his advantage.

Hambirrao Mohite was not at Raigad but was in the territory of Karad at the time of Shivaji's death.[49] The poet of the Paramanandakavya tells us that Sambhaji wrote to Hambirrao, "Chhatrapati Shivaji has bequeathed the Svarajya to me to fight against the Emperor of Delhi".[50]

It can be gathered from the communication of Sambhaji to Hambirrao that Sambhaji tried to take advantage of the succession issue which Chhatrapati Shivaji had left publicly unresolved during the short time which he had from the time of his talk he had with Sambhaji after Sambhaji's return from the Mughal camp to Panhala (13th January, 1680) to the time of his death (3rd April, 1680). Since there did not exist an unequivocal public pronouncement of Shivaji about his successor, some section of the subjects of the Svarajya who were of orthodox mind, naturally seem to have thought that Sambhaji being the eldest son of Shivaji, he should succeed to the throne of the Svarajya.[51] As Chhatrapati

---

49. Chitnis-Sambhaji Bakhar, F.N.19, p.5.
50. Section III, Canto I, Verses 21-37, Pp.34-35.
51. For example, see, Chitnis-Sambhaji Bakhar, Pp.3-6. Chitnis points out that Balaji Avaji Chitnis and many other persons had taken it for granted that as Sambhaji was the eldest son of Shivaji; he was the heir to Shivaji's throne.

Shivaji had brought back Sambhaji from the Mughal camp and had by giving the administration of Panhala under him, associated Sambhaji in the administrative set up of the Svarajya; they do not seem to have, though they should have, taken a serious view about the anti-Svarajya activity conducted by Sambhaji in collusion with the Mughals during 1678-1679. As a result of the steps of Shivaji to bring back Sambhaji from the Mughal camp and to associate him in the administration of the Svarajya, even though Sambhaji's guilt against the Svarajya was such that by condoning it no one should have ever regarded him as a fit person to become the Chhatrapati; some section of the people of the Svarajya seem to have felt perplexed about the issue of the succession to Shivaji's throne in the absence of Shivaji's categorical pronouncement to that effect. Sambhaji might also have secured the benefit of that section's support, who, knowing in general, the unfair attitude of the step-mothers towards their step-sons in the world, might have thought that Sambhaji was a victim of the unfair attitude of Queen Soyarabai, his step-mother; though, as has been proved earlier, she was not in any way against Sambhaji till he joined the Mughals against the Svarajya; and who tried to keep the news of Shivaji's death secret for few days and had brought her son Rajaram on the throne of Shivaji with the help of the Ministers

of Shivaji in the absence of Shivaji's public announcement to that effect. That seems to have caused doubts in the mind of some section of the people of the Svarajya about their bringing Rajaram on the throne of Shivaji.

That, Sambhaji also seems to have carried out such a propaganda to win peoples' support for his succession to Shivaji's throne is proved by his letter which he is said to have written to Hambirrao Mohite according to the poet of the Paramanandakavya. In that letter Sambhaji has called Shivaji's Ministers as the Kumantrinah evil (minded) ministers[52] even though as has been shown earlier, they were in no way against Sambhaji prior to his desertion to the Mughals (13th December, 1678), and to whom Sambhaji himself had called as "honest ministers" prior to his desertion.

As a result of the contents of the letter of Sambhaji it seems that Hambirrao pledged his support for the succession of Sambhaji to the throne of Chhatrapati Shivaji and opposed Peshwa Moropant Pingle, Annaji Datto and others who had installed Rajaram as the successor of Shivaji in the Svarajya.[53] When their Commander-in-Chief became a supporter of the cause of Sambhaji's succession to the throne of Shivaji, it seems that in those circumstances, some of the Maratha troops espoused

---

52. Paramanandakavya, Section III, Canto I, Verses 29-32, p.35.
53. Ibid., Section III, Canto II, Verses 24-41, Pp.38-39; Chitnis-Sambhaji Bakhar, Pp.5-6.

the cause of Sambhaji and they flocked around Sambhaji at Panhala.[54] That made Sambhaji a powerful rival of Rajaram for the throne of Shivaji.

Seeing that Sambhaji had set-up himself as a rival claimant to the throne of Shivaji and that he had managed to secure the backing of Himbirrao Mohite and thereby largely of the Maratha troops; Peshwa Moropant Pingle, Annaji Datto and others seem to have realized that the issue of the succession to the throne of Shivaji would be solved by a civil war only. To avoid that calamity, Peshwa Moropant Pingle, Annaji Datto and others seem to have made efforts. Some information about those efforts is given by Sabhasad in the form of the last talk which Chhatrapati Shivaji had before his death with Pralhad Niraji and other persons who were around him when he breathed his last.[55] In that talk, Shivaji is shown as predicting the conditions which would prevail in the Svarajya after his death. In that talk Shivaji said, "I had suggested at fort Panhala (on 13th January, 1680) to my eldest son, Sambhaji, that I have two sons (Sambhaji and Rajaram). I will divide my kingdom between you both. (But because Sambhaji did not show his inclination for the division of the kingdom, I feel that). After my death, Sambhaji

---

54. Sen-ERS-II, No.501, Pp.310-311.
55. Sabhasad-Shivaji Bakhar, Pp.107-109.

will bring under him the entire kingdom (Svarajya). The army will go over to Sambhaji because he is the eldest king. As Rajaram is younger, the army will not go to his side (will not support him). The Ministers will be in favour of Rajaram, (the king); and (they) will suggest the division of the kingdom (Svarajya) into two kingdoms (one for Sambhaji and the other one for Rajaram). In the end, the army will not like the proposal of the Ministers. The army will show trust in the Ministers but finally will arrest them."

This passage from Sabhasad's Bakhar of Shivaji is of great importance as it gives us the credible details of the matters which developed in the Svarajya from the time after the death of Chhatrapati Shivaji to the time when Sambhaji became the master of the Svarajya. Though Sabhasad has shown in his work that those things were talked about by Chhatrapati Shivaji at the time of his death; those are the very happenings which Sabhasad himself had seen taking place in the Svarajya after the death of Shivaji. It might be that because Sabhasad wanted to show to the readers of his Bakhar of Shivaji that Shivaji was a statesman of great foresight, he was led to put those future happenings in the Svarajya in the mouth of Shivaji. But simply because those things are presented by Sabhasad in that form does not minimize their value in the historical

analysis when those are corroborated by the facts found in the other historical sources.

From the matters stated by Sabhasad in the above passage, it seems that to save the Svarajya from the evils of a civil war it was that Peshwa Moropant Pingle, Annaji Datto and others, prudently suggested to Sambhaji the division of Shivaji's Kingdom (Svarajya) between Rajaram and Sambhaji. According to their proposal , which we learn from the poet of the Paramanandakavya, the Ministers of Shivaji, who supported Rajaram, suggested to Sambhaji that "Chhatrapati Shivaji has given prince Rajaram under our care and the entire kingdom (Svarajya) belongs to him. If you want, at the most, you may accept the kingdom of Karnataka (a part of the Svarajya) as your share. If you will not accept the kingdom of Karnataka as your share, you will have no alternative than to go to Aurangzeb (as you had gone earlier)."[56]

It seems that Peshwa Moropant Pingle, Annaji Datto and others made this suggestion for the division of the Svarajya into two kingdoms to Sambhaji because they must have thought that it would be acceptable to Sambhaji, who had in the life-time of Shivaji itself, had asked for his 'share' in the Svarajya and had by that impliedly

---

56. Paramanandakavya, Section III, Canto II, Verses 18-21, p.37.

indicated that prince Rajaram had also a share in it. In the light of this, we do not agree with the historians when they ascribe blame to the Ministers of Shivaji for having suggested the division of the Svarajya between Sambhaji and Rajaram.[57] As it was Sambhaji, who had sponsored and pursued the idea of the division of the Svarajya between himself and Shivaji since the time of the Karnataka expedition of Shivaji(October, 1676) to the time of his return to the Svarajya from the Mughal camp (December, 1679); we do not feel, that the Ministers of Shivaji were in the wrong, if, by feeling that Sambhaji may agree to the division of the Svarajya between himself and Rajaram they put the proposal to that effect before Sambhaji in order to save the Svarajya from the evils of a civil war.

The view of some historians that the Ministers of Shivaji wanted to ruin the Svarajya, which was to remain in Maharashtra after its division between Rajaram and Sambhaji, by making it fall an easy prey to Aurangzeb's personal attack when they suggested that the kingdom of Karnataka, which was safe from the attack of the Mughals, should be taken by Sambhaji and Rajaram should reign as the king of the territory of the Svarajya in Maharashtra[58] is also not correct. This view is based

---

57. Bendre - Sambhaji, p.154.
58. Ibid., p.136, 148, 154.

upon those historians' incorrect application of the data found about the likely Mughal attack on the Svarajya in the letter of Chhatrapati Shivaji to Moro Trimbak Pradhan (Peshwa Moropant Pingle) dated the 10th January, 1679,[59] and their incorrect corroboration of that data with the incredible data found in the Paramanandakavya[60] to analyse the political situation which existed in the Svarajya after the death of Shivaji (3rd April, 1680) to the time when Sambhaji managed to defeat Peshwa Moropant Pingle and Annaji Datto (Sometime during 19th May to 16th June, 1680). When that data used by those historians from these two sources to ascribe blame to Shivaji's ministers is put to scrutiny, we find that their contention is historically not sound.

For, the letter dated 10th January, 1679, of Shivaji to Peshwa Moropant Pingle has in it only this information that additional Mughal army is coming in the Deccan; to face it, Shivaji will have to send his Commander-in-Chief and Moropant Pingle; and Moropant Pingle should keep the army under him ready for that task.[61] These contents of that letter do not suggest even remotely, as has been suggested on their basis by those historians[62] that

---

59. Chitale, V.C., Eka Ullekhaniya Aprakashit Grantha, (BISMQ XXIX, Nos.3-4, Lekhanka II, Pp.83-84); Bendre - Sambhaji, Pp. 120-121; 148.
60. Section III, Canto I, Verses 13-14; Bendre-Sambhaji, p.148.
61. Chitale, V.C., Eka Ullekhaniya Aprakashit Grantha, (BISMQ XXIX, Nos.3-4, Lekhanka II, Pp.83-84).
62. For example, See, Bendre-Sambhaji, p.148.

Aurangzeb, the emperor of Delhi, was personally coming down to attack the Deccan. Moreover, the hollowness of this contention of those historians is proved completely when we take into account the military necessity which had kept emperor Aurangzeb, tied in Rajputana personally from 9th January, 1679, to June, 1681. During this period, Aurangzeb, with a motive to annex the Rajput kingdom of Jodhpur, after the death of Maharaja Jaswant-singh, its ruler, had invaded Rajputana with a vast Mughal army. In that, during this period prince Akbar, the fourth son of Aurangzeb, had rebelled against him with the support of the Rajputs and had proved a great threat to the throne of Delhi. With the help of cunning diplomacy when Aurangzeb caused the desertion of the Rajputs from Akbar; Akbar fled from Rajputana and reaching Pali in Konkan on 1st June, 1681, solicited refuge from Sambhaji, who had by that time become the master of the Svarajya. After that, to put down the antagonistic posture of Sambhaji and Akbar against him it was; that Aurangzeb patched up his conflict with the Rajputs by a Peace Treaty with them on 16th January, 1681.[63]

---

63. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha - Pagadi, Pp.73-74; 78; Storia Do Mogor II, Pp.227-236; Sarkar- Auranzib III, Pp.216-248; Sarkar-House of Shivaji, p.200; Satish Chandra, Introduction, (Parties and Politics at the Mughal Court, 1707-1740, Pp.XXXVIII-XXXIX; xlii).

In view of the above facts of Aurangzeb's political activity in Rajputana, it is clear that those historians' acceptance of the version of the poet of the Paramanandakavya that the people of the Svarajya were afraid of the attack of Aurangzeb at the time when Shivaji's succession issue was being resolved,[64] is not correct. That the poet of the Paramanandakavya, who is a partizan of Sambhaji has exerted in his work, to show some how, even by presenting historically unsound situations to support the correctness of Sambhaji's succession to Shivaji's throne, has not been taken into account by those historians. As a result, they have been led to accept as true, the historically incorrect matters stated in the Paramanandakavya, without putting those to cross examination with the facts available in the contemporary credible sources.

It seems that there was much sense in the proposal which was put forth by Peshwa Moropant Pingle, Annaji Datto and others before Sambhaji about the division of the Svarajya into two separate kingdoms and according to which the territory of the Svarajya in Karnataka would have been under Sambhaji and the territory of the Svarajya, in Maharashtra would have been under Rajaram. If Sambhaji would have accepted that plan, the Svarajya would have been spared from the eventuality of a civil war

---

64. Paramanandakavya, Section III, Canto I, Verses 13-14, p.34.

between the supporters of Rajaram and the adherents of Sambhaji, and due to it the creation of the ill-will between those two groups would have been avoided.

But Sambhaji, who, in the life-time of Shivaji was ready to be satisfied with only his own share in the Svarajya, turned down the proposal of Peshwa Moropant Pingle, Annaji Datto and others to effect the division of the Svarajya into two kingdoms. This might have been because he felt himself sufficiently strong to conquer the Svarajya and capture the throne of Shivaji with the help of Hambirrao, the Commander-in-Chief of the Maratha forces.

When their proposal of the division of the Svarajya into two kingdoms was turned down by Sambhaji, Peshwa Moropant Pingle, Annaji Datto and others, who upheld the cause of Rajaram to the throne of Shivaji, had no alternative than to march against Sambhaji, who had set up himself as a rival ruler.

Accordingly, Peshwa Moropant Pingle led an expedition against Sambhaji.

Before taking that step to resolve the issue of Shivaji's succession, Peshwa Moropant Pingle and Annaji Datto seem to have written a letter to Hambirrao Mohite in which they urged upon him to support the succession of Rajaram to the throne of Shivaji. As a reply to their letter Hambirrao wrote " Wherever you will go, I am behind

you".[65] Peshwa Moropant Pingle, Annaji Datto and others seem to have construed from the reply of Hambirrao Mohite that he supported the succession of Rajaram.

After that, under them the supporters of Rajaram went in an expedition against Sambhaji who was at fort Panhala at that time. It appears that seeing that Peshwa Moropant Pingle, Annaji Datto and others had left Raigad to proceed against Sambhaji, on 16th May, 1680, the supporters of Sambhaji tried to bring Raigad under their control by creating some trouble in it. But the supporters of Rajaram seem to have arrested them[66] and defeated their attempt.

When Peshwa Moropant Pingle, Annaji Datto, Rahuji Somnath, Pralhad Niraji[67] and others with their troops arrived near Karad, Hambirrao Mohite, who was in that area with the army under him, sent a message to Peshwa Moropant Pingle and Annaji Datto and expressed his desire to see them in a secret meeting. It seems that Peshwa Moropant Pingle and Annaji Datto, who wanted to save the Svarajya from the civil war, eagerly gave consent to Hambirrao's proposal and met him. In that secret meeting, Peshwa Moropant Pingle and Annaji Datto were duped by Hambirrao Mohite as he put them under arrest.

---

65. Ibid., Section III, Canto I, Verses 39-42, Pp.35-36.
66. Shivapur Daftaratil Yadi, p.53.
67. Paramanandakavya, Section III, Canto IV, Verses 121-125, Pp.50-51.

Disarming Peshwa Moropant Pingle and Annaji Datto, Hambirrao Mohite sent them in chains to Sambhaji at Panhala, sometime during 19th May to 16th June, 1680.[68] That brought to an end the attempt of Peshwa Moropant Pingle, the most trusted man of Shivaji. It is probable that Sambhaji, who wanted to possess political power since long, might have asked Hambirrao Mohite, to invite Moropant by giving confidence to a meeting and then to put him under arrest.

Having seen that their leaders, Peshwa Moropant Pingle and Annaji Datto were captured by Hambirrao Mohite , the confidence of the supporters of Rajaram, seems to have got fizzled out. Seeing no possibility of putting forth any resistance in the path of Sambhaji to Shivaji's throne, they succumbed to the stark reality of life, surrendered to Hambirrao and thereby hailed Sambhaji as their ruler.[69] Though Sambhaji succeeded like this in satisfying his desire for political power by resorting to unfair means; he left behind a trail of acrimony in the mind of his subjects, which was to be a disturbing force for him throughout his reign.

Bendre, V.S. has not taken into account the significance of the grave offence which Sambhaji had committed against the Svarajya during 1678-1679 in the matter of the issue of succession to Shivaji's throne.

---

68. Ibid., Section III, Canto II, Verses 22-41, Pp.37-39; Jedhe Shakavali, p.30.
69. Jedhe Shakavali, p.30.

Since by all human considerations the person who is to be a king is required to be without any blemish and since the Indian laws, practices and religious and constitutional considerations do not sanction the coming on the throne of a person who has with the help of its enemies attacked his own state; it is clear that Sambhaji had no claim to the throne of Shivaji. Bendre has completely overlooked this matter while discussing the succession of Sambhaji to the throne of Shivaji in his work on Sambhaji. As a result, he has been led to ignore the crucial English evidence of 27th April, 1680,[70] which proves that Sambhaji had taken the title of a Raja and which shows that he had set up himself as a rival ruler to Rajaram, whose Manchakarohana ceremony was performed by Peshwa Moropant Pingle, Annaji Datto and others on 21st April, 1680, and to whom they had properly declared as a legitimate successor of Shivaji. Bendre has also not taken into account the position and the role which was played by Moropant Pingle as a Peshwa to resolve the issue of succession to Shivaji's throne in the Svarajya.

In the Council of Ministers of Shivaji the Peshwa (the Prime Minister) was more important than the other ministers of that Council.[71] According to M.G. Ranade[72]

---

70. Sen-ERS-II, No.503, p.311.
71. Joshi,S.N., Rajyakarabhancha Abhyasa, p.81.
72. Rise of the Maratha Power, p.126.

" The Peshwa was Prime Minister, next to the King (Shivaji), and was at the head of both the civil and military administration." J. Sarkar[73] feels that "His (Prime Minister's or Peshwa's) duties were to look after the welfare of the State in general terms, to represent the King in his absence, and to keep peace among the other officers, so as to promote harmony in the administration. All royal letters and charters had to bear his seal below the King's". S.V.Venkateshwar[74] has expressed the view that "the Mukhya (Peshwa) was the King's Vice-regent, and combined civil and military functions".

It is clear from this as well as from the analysis we have presented of the happenings which took place in the Svarajya after the death of Chhatrapati Shivaji to the arrest made by Hambirrao Mohite of Peshwa Moropant Pingle, that Moropant Pingle had played an important role to settle the matter about the succession to Shivaji's throne in perfect order according to the powers which accrued to him by way of his position as a Peshwa in the Council of Ministers of Shivaji. In that matter he was supported by Queen Soyarabai, and Annaji Datto Sachiv and Pralhad Niraji Nyayadhish, the other

---

73. Shivaji, p.361.
74. Indian Culture Through the Ages, Vol. II - Public Life and Political Institutions, p.230.

important ministers of Shivaji. Therefore, his installation of prince Rajaram on the throne of Shivaji was constitutional. In defiance to that, when Sambhaji set up himself as a rival to Rajaram they had no alternative than to regard Sambhaji as a rebel from constitutional point of view. And therefore, to put down Sambhaji became the primary duty of Peshwa Moropant Pingle in which as we have shown, he became unsuccessful. Bendre has not taken into account all these matters in his work on Sambhaji while analysing the matters by which Sambhaji acquired Shivaji's throne.

In her work on Sambhaji, though Kamal Gokhale admits that "as a result of the joining of Sambhaji to the Mughals against the Svarajya, his claim to its throne was undoubtedly damaged",[75] she has surprisingly expressed the view that " to come to the throne of Shivaji by exercising his <u>right</u> to it, Sambhaji had acted properly in arresting the persons who came in his way to assert his hereditary right to it".[76]

This writing of Kamal Gokhale is not in tune with the procedure of succession to the throne followed in India since ancient times. The rules followed for succession to the throne in India show that "Succession was normally by primogeniture but exception might often occur, for

---

75. Gokhale-<u>Sambhaji</u>, p.80.
76. <u>Ibid</u>., p.81.

the Sacred Law did not allow a diseased, maimed or seriously infirm prince to ascend the throne, and the line could not pass through such a prince .... Moral perversity might also exclude a prince from succession. 'A wicked son, though an only one', says the Arthashastra 'should never ascend the throne'. Kings sometimes nominated their successors, overriding the claims of their eldest sons if they were given to evil courses".[77] In fact, Kautilya is very much categorical about this. He says "never shall a wicked and an only son be installed (by the king or the ministers) on the royal throne".[78]

In view of these meticulous rules followed in India for the succession of a prince to the throne; and as Sambhaji had proved himself to be a wicked person, (who had performed Kuveda for the early death of Shivaji and who by joining the enemies (Mughals) had attacked the Svarajya), it becomes clear that the claim of Sambhaji to the throne of the Svarajya was forfeited the movement he had joined the Mughals in December, 1678, and had attacked the Svarajya in collusion with them. Since Kamal Gokhale has failed to realize this stark reality while analysing the issue of the succession to Shivaji's throne, she has not thought about the eventuality of a civil war created in the Svarajya by Sambhaji and

---

77. Basham, A.L., The Wonder that was India, p.93.
78. Arthashastra, p.34.

subsequently the arrest effected of Peshwa Moropant Pingle and Annaji Datto treacherously by Hambirrao Mohite in order to bring Sambhaji on the throne of Shivaji. Hence the version which she has given about the actions undertaken by Sambhaji to acquire the throne of the Svarajya cannot be accepted as correct.

After cowing down the opposition, Sambhaji set himself upon the task of establishing his authority in the Svarajya. The English news of 3rd June, 1680,[79] gives the information that Sambhaji was having in his possession all that his father (Shivaji) had; he was still at Panhala with an army of 1000 troops to whom he had paid two months wages before hand. From this it is clear that earlier to the 3rd June, 1680, Sambhaji's position was firmly established in the political field of the Svarajya. To make it undisputed, he was still required to bring under his control the seat of the Maratha government at Raigad and which was still under the control of the supporters of Rajaram. Therefore, Sambhaji kept at fort Panhala, Malhoji Ghorpade, who had been earlier appointed as the Sarnobat (Commander) at that fort by Chhatrapati Shivaji with an army; and set out from that fort to Raigad to bring under him the main seat of the Maratha government at that place.[80]

---

79. Sen-ERS-II, No.508, p.313.
80. Sardesai, Kale, Wakaskar-Kavyethihasa Sangrahatil Patren,Yadi, Lekh, etc., No.435, p.313

It seems that in that matter Sambhaji was also prompted by Kavi Kalash, a Brahmin from Kanauj, who was an adherent of/Shakti cult and who had secured Sambhaji's highest confidence by that time, to bring Raigad under him and then to perform his coronation at that place.[81]

Before proceeding on his way to Raigad, Sambhaji seems to have come down from Panhala to Kolhapur in order to put down the resistance of Janardanpant Hanamante, the Sumant also called as the Dabir - (Foreign Minister) of Chhatrapati Shivaji, who, still seems to have been a supporter of Rajaram. Though the details of the conflict between them are not available in the extant sources, it is gathered that finally Sambhaji succeeded in arresting Janardanpant Hanamante.[82]

From Kolhapur, on his way to Raigad, Sambhaji seems to have reached village Korati on 3rd June, 1680.[83] There, Sambhaji visited Malhar Gosavi Sadavrati, a pious and learned scholar in the Vedas, probably to secure his blessings. By his Adnyapatra, Sambhaji, who had by that time assumed the title Chhatrapati, renewed the Agrahara of village Nadoli, which, after discontinuing for some period, was again continued by Chhatrapati Shivaji to Malhar Gosavi Sadavrati.[84]

---

81. Paramanandakavya, Section III, Canto III, Verses 8-14, p.40.
82. Chitnis-Sambhaji Bakhar, Pp.4-6; Modak-Chhoti Bakhar, p.50.
83. Sanads and Letters, No.22, p.135.
84. Ibid., Pp.135-136; SPSS-II, No.2262, p.692; Sambhaji Shakavali, Pp.102-103.

It appears from the English document of 10th June, 1680, that Sambhaji had appointed his new Subhedar at Rajapur. When the English factors at Rajapur asked him for the payment of a "bucksis", which Shivaji used to give them; the Subhedar told them that unless he had orders from Sambhaji, he cannot do anything in that matter. Thereupon the English wrote about it to Sambhaji. It seems that as Sambhaji had not settled himself as yet at Raigad, he wrote to the English that "at present he had other concerns in hand; but when at more leisure, he would examine our (English) accounts".[85]

Leaving Korati, Sambhaji went to Karad and from there to Pratapgad. There he worshipped his family diety, goddess Tulaja Bhavani and then proceeded towards Raigad.[86] After reaching Mahad, Sambhaji hurriedly went to Pachad (a village at the foot of Raigad),[87] and receiving the obeisance of the Maratha nobles there, Sambhaji

---

85. Sen-ERS-II, No.509,p.313, Bucksis is explained by Dr. Sen, , "An Index of Unusual Words" (Ibid., p.XXXIX), as a present or gift to an inferior; the amount paid as a reparation for the losses at Rajapur is always treated as a free gift from Shivaji and hence the use of this word. Shivaji claimed that the English had no right to such a reparation as the English factory was plundered while it was in enemy country. In this case of Sambhaji, it seems that the English wished to have reparation from him which they felt had due to them from Shivaji.
86. Paramanandakavya, Section III, Canto III, Verses 15-31, Pp.40-41.
87. Chitnis-Sambhaji Bakhar, p.6.

climbed the hill on which Raigad is situated. Since some of the persons in that fort had secretly joined the faction of Sambhaji and as the doors of Raigad were not closed by them properly,[88] Sambhaji could effect his entry easily in Raigad on 18th June, 1680.[89]

Sambhaji seems to have established his control on Raigad by arresting its Havaldar, Kanhoji Bhandavalkar and by putting to sword Mal Sawant and others[90] who were the supporters of the cause of Rajaram. Sambhaji also put Rajaram under arrest[91] at that time but he seems to have set him free after he firmly established his authority in the Svarajya.[92] But Sambhaji did not revile and put to death at that time Queen Soyarabai, as is contented by Chitnis,[93] and on Chitnis' authority,

---

88. Ibid., This disproves the surmise of Shri.Bendre (Sambhaji, p.156) that the Sarnobat and the Nayakvadi of Raigad had brought under their control that fort for Sambhaji on 16th May, 1680, when Peshwa Moropant Pingle and Annaji Datto had gone out of it on an expedition of Panhala against Sambhaji earlier to that date. His contention that when the father-in-law of Sambhaji,Pilajirao Shirke had brought Raigad under his control before Sambhaji entered it (Ibid.), is also not correct. These surmises of Bendre are based on the data of the Chhoti Bakhar which is a short version of the Sambhaji Bakhar of Chitnis(see, Modak-Chhoti Bakhar, p.1,F.N.1). Therefore, as the Sambhaji Bakhar of Chitnis is the original in this case, we have accepted its data as credible in this matter.
89. Jedhe Shakavali, p.30.
90. Chitnis-Sambhaji Bakhar,Pp.6-7.
91. Jedhe Shakavali, p.30.
92. Joshi,P.S.,Early Life of Chhatrapati Rajaram(1670-1689 A.D.)(QRHS,VII,No.3,Pp.181-184);shows that Sambhaji had later associated Rajaram in the military matters of the Svarajya.
93. Chitnis-Sambhaji Bakhar, p.7.

by J.N. Sarkar .[94] For, we learn from the contemporary English sources[95] that Queen Soyarabai did not die at this time but she committed suicide at a much later date, that is, on 27th October, 1681. The poet of the Paramanandakavya, also tells us that Sambhaji treated Soyarabai and Rajaram well[96] after his authority settled down at Raigad. It is probable that Sambhaji did not ill-treat Queen Soyarabai and Rajaram because Sambhaji owed his throne to Hambirrao Mohite, the Commander-in-Chief of the Maratha forces, who was the brother of Queen Soyarabai and the maternal uncle of Rajaram. Sambhaji established his full control on Raigad with the help of his father-in-law, Pilajirao Shirke, who had come to Raigad with his ten to fifteen thousand troops.[97]

Sambhaji then proclaimed to all the officers in the Svarajya about the assumption of the royal power by him.[98] When he had started attending the work of the Maratha administration, his step-mother, Putalabai, the fourth wife of Chhatrapati Shivaji, immolated herself as a Sati on 27th June, 1680.[99]

After feeling secure about his hold on the Svarajya, Sambhaji performed his Manchakarohana ceremony on

---

94. Auranzib, IV, p.243.
95. Sambhaji Shakavali, p.109; Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.83.
96. Section III, Canto IV, Verse 3, p.42.
97. Chitnis-Sambhaji Bakhar, p.6.
98. Ibid., p.7.
99. Shivapur Daftaratil Yadi, p.53.

20th July, 1680,[100] and thereby fulfilled his long standing ambition to become the Chhatrapati.

It seems that since long Sambhaji had not expected his path to the throne of Shivaji easy. This might be because of the guilt he had earlier committed against the Svarajya by deserting to the Mughals and by attacking it in collusion with them. For, had it not been so, he would not have been required to pledge a vow to the God to be fulfilled if he was to become the master of the Svarajya as has been stated by him in his Bakre Danapatra.[101]

The Bakre Danapatra is an official document of Sambhaji issued on 24th August, 1680, to a priest who was the son of Namdev Bhatta Bakre of the sacred place, Parashuram (in Konkan). Sambhaji has stated in it that "the ministers of Shivaji were against him. They poisoned the mind of Queen Soyarabai by saying that the eldest son of Shivaji (Sambhaji) should not be allowed to inherit the kingdom of Shivaji. Due to the partiality of Shivaji towards Soyarabai, Shivaji formed a bad opinion against him (Sambhaji). Therefore, he abandoned the Svarajya, and in collusion with Mughal general Dilerkhan, attacked and conquered Bhupalgad of the Svarajya."[102]

---

100. Jedhe Shakavali, p.30; Chitnis-Sambhaji Bakhar, p.7; Shivapur Daftaratil Yadi, p.53.
101. Bakre Danapatra, Pp.432-433.
102. Ibid.

The audacious and blatant manner in which Sambhaji has proclaimed his guilt against the Svarajya is indicative of his haughty, thoughtless and reckless character. In the Bakre Danapatra, he is not struck by any remorse for his misdeeds even when his objective to become the king had been achieved. A sensible and straight minded ruler, in order to develop confidence and good will in his subjects would have preferred to show repentance for his earlier misdeeds. But instead of doing so, Sambhaji is seen in the Bakre Danapatra as covering his guilt against the Svarajya by ascribing blemish to Shivaji.

When the blemish ascribed by Sambhaji to Shivaji is put to test, we do not get any proof for it from the extant sources other than the Paramanandakavya and the Shiva Digvijaya Bakhar whose incredibility in the matters of the Griha Kalaha (Domestic Quarrel) and the Antastha Kalaha (Internal Quarrel of the ministers of Shivaji with Sambhaji) to support the writing of Sambhaji to that effect in the Bakre Danapatra has been proved earlier. There is no credible proof available to show that the ministers of Shivaji had poisoned the mind of Soyarabai; Soyarabai had instigated Shivaji against Sambhaji; and due to his partiality towards her, Shivaji had done any injustice to Sambhaji.

If Shivaji really had been partial towards Soyarabai

and Rajaram, and would have been against Sambhaji, he would not have tried to bring back Sambhaji to Svarajya from the Mughal camp. It was possible for him to declare Sambhaji as an out-law. But Shivaji did not do this as he seems to be a loving father to Sambhaji. Probably, feeling that Sambhaji, who was a valient and well trained prince, may become sensible in time to come and serve Svarajya it was that Shivaji brought him back from the Mughals.

But in his Bakre Danapatra without showing any sense of gratitude to Shivaji, who gave him an opportunity to live a new life, Sambhaji, with the help of a fabricated story, has preferred to dub him as a person who acted according to the wishes of his wife, Soyarabai. This proves that Sambhaji was an ungrateful and wicked person.

After becoming the Chhatrapati, Sambhaji should have become a sensible person of responsibility. Some persons, when they become men of responsibility, try to improve their conduct and act with dignity to prove to the people their worthiness to the office. But Chhatrapati Sambhaji does not appear to be a person of that type. Instead of taking steps to soothe the sentiments of hatred and distrust generated in the mind of the subjects of the Svarajya, Sambhaji seems to have resorted to such antics of the spreading of the fabricated stories about

Shivaji, Soyarabai and the honest ministers of Shivaji to white-wash his earlier misdeeds towards the Svarajya. The result of such actions of Sambhaji seems to have been the generation of deep animosity against him in the mind of the subjects of the Svarajya who worked at times in future to attempt his life. For the time being, Chhatrapati Sambhaji had ascended the throne with the help of the military troops of Hambirrao Mohite.

After becoming the Chhatrapati, Sambhaji was required to pay attention to recast the administrative structure.

It seems that Sambhaji had put Peshwa Moropant Pingle and Annaji Datto, the Sachiv, under house arrest.[103] But he released Moropant at the time of his Manchakarohana ceremony.[104] After that it seems that Sambhaji got the work of Peshwa Moropant Pingle done through Mutalik (Deputy) of Moropant upto the time of the death of Moropant sometime during 29th September, to 12th October, 1680. After the death of Peshwa Moropant Pingle, Sambhaji gave the post of the Peshwa to Moropant's son, Nilopant, by setting him free from the confinement in which Sambhaji seems to have kept him[105] along with Moropant.

Sambhaji had also kept Annaji Datto, the Sachiv or Surnis of Shivaji, under house arrest when Hambirrao Mohite

---

103. Chitnis-Sambhaji Bakhar, p.6.
104. Sardesai-Sambhaji, p.24.
105. Jedhe Shakavali, Pp.30-31.

had trecherously arrested Peshwa Moropant and Annaji and had sent them to Panhala. Annaji Datto was released by Sambhaji probably after the death of Peshwa Moropant Pingle. But instead of restoring him to his previous position of the Sachiv (Finance Minister), Sambhaji gave him the post of the Amatya or the Mujumdar (Revenue Minister).[106] Earlier to that this post was managed by Kavi Kalash, the protege of Sambhaji. This was because that post had fallen vacant due to the disfavour which Raghunath Narayan Hanamante, the Mujumdar of Shivaji since 1677, had incurred of Sambhaji,as he had joined the faction which had opposed Sambhaji's succession to Shivaji's throne.[107] Till the time Annaji Datto was under house arrest, it seems that Sambhaji got the work of the Sachiv done through the deputy (Mutalik) of Annaji Datto.

Sambhaji continued Pralhad Niraji in the post of the Nyayadhish (the Chief Judge),which he had held under Chhatrapati Shivaji as is proved by the documents of the reign of Sambhaji.[108]

The post of the Panditrao (Minister for Religion) was held by Moreshwar Raghunath since 1672 under Shivaji. As is seen from the documents of Moreshwar Raghunath,[109]

---

106. Ibid.
107. Bendre-Sambhaji, p.130.
108. Nos.250,251 (BISMQ XXX, No.1-2, p.83).
109. Nos.35,36, (BISMQ XXX, No.1-2, p.11).

Chhatrapati Sambhaji continued him in the post of the Panditrao.

Hambirrao Mohite, the Senapati or Sarnobat (Commander-in-Chief) of Chhatrapati Shivaji and the benefactor of Sambhaji was continued by Sambhaji in that post.[110]

Dattaji Trimal (Trimbak) was the Wakenavis or Mantri (Personal Adviser, Home Member or Chief Secretary) of Chhatrapati Shivaji in 1667 after Gangaji Mangaji.[111] Dattaji Trimal died on 28th December, 1678.[112] It seems that instead of appointing his son, Ramchandra Dattaji to the post of the Wakenavis, Shivaji appointed Janardanpant Hanamante as the Wakenavis.[113] It seems that Janardanpant Hanamante was in that post for a short time, and after that, he was given the post of the Dabir or Sumant by Shivaji.[114] Janardanpant Hanamante seems to have remained in the post of the Dabir upto the time of his death which took place on 28th June, 1683,[115] during the reign of Sambhaji.

As a result of giving the post of the Dabir by Shivaji to Janardanpant Hanamante, the post of the Wakenavis had become vacant. It seems that Shivaji

---

110. Sardesai-Sambhaji, p.33; Bendre-Shivaji-II, Pp.1075-1076.
111. Bendre-Shivaji-II, p.1074.
112. Jedhe Shakavali, p.29.
113. Bendre-Shivaji-II, p.1076.
114. Vad-Shahu Chhatrapati, p.69.
115. Sardesai, G.S., Historical Geneologies, p.159.

gave it to Ramchandra Dattaji, the son of Dattaji Trimal (Trimbak). V.S. Bendre has stated that Ramchandra Dattaji who was continued by Chhatrapati Shivaji as the Wakenavis was sent by Sambhaji as a Mutalik (Public Officer) to the courts of the Sultans of Bijapur and Golkonda. As a result, V.S. Bendre is led to feel that when his post of the Wakenavis became vacant, it was given probably to Kavi Kalash by Chhatrapati Sambhaji from the beginning of his reign.[116] By this, Chhatrapati Sambhaji made Kavi Kalash a member of his Council of Ministers.[117]

We cannot accept this contention of Bendre as he has not given any historical evidence to substantiate it. Moreover, there does not exist any historical source of the reign of Sambhaji which shows that Kavi Kalash had held the post of the Wakenavis in the ministry of Sambhaji. From the extant historical sources we do not get any positive information about the Wakenavis of Sambhaji. From the arrangement stated above, which Chhatrapati Sambhaji had settled for the administration of the Svarajya, it is clear that he continued in the Ministerial posts the persons or their sons who had been in the Ministerial posts during the reign of Chhatrapati Shivaji. That has led some

---

116. Bendre-Sambhaji, p.132.
117. Ibid., Pp.132-133.

historians[118] apparently to feel that Sambhaji had set up his administrative structure on the lines on which Chhatrapati Shivaji had set it up and that there was nothing untoward or wrong in it. As a result, they have failed to perceive in their works as to how the introduction of Kavi Kalash in the Council of Ministers by Sambhaji as the Chhandogamatya proved to be a disturbing factor in the administration of Sambhaji.

The extant historical sources do not give any information about Kavi Kalash after the time of the visit of Shivaji to Agra.

Sardesai, G.S.[119] is of the view that "Kavi Kalash who is also called as Kalusha, Kaviji, Kabiji and Kabaji in the Marathi historical sources, probably might have come to Maharashtra at the time of the coronation ceremony of Shivaji (June, 1674). The reliable information about the early life of Kalusha is not available in the extant historical resources. It is likely that Chhatrapati Shivaji might have bestowed on Kalusha the title Kavi Kalasha, (a highly gifted poet among other poets) at the time of his coronation(June, 1674). From this it appears that Kavi Kalasha had composed poetry in Hindi and he was a scholar in the Sanskrit language".

---

118. Ibid., p.133, 163; Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.347.
119. Sambhaji, p.31.

It is not known as to what was Kavi Kalash in the court of Chhatrapati Shivaji, or what he was doing in the Svarajya after the coronation of Shivaji. He was present at Shringarpur along with Yuvaraj Sambhaji, when Shivaji, while leaving for the Karnataka expedition in October, 1676, had made Sambhaji to stay at that place. But no information is available about the work he did there.

In the Paramanandakavya, its poet has given the information about the greatness of the Shakti cult; how,because of the acceptance of that cult, Sambhaji became the master of the Svarajya even though Sambhaji and others had thought it to be an impossibility; and how the unexpected and sudden death of Shivaji, which was necessary to facilitate Sambhaji's becoming the master of the Svarajya, took place. It is also stated in the Paramanandakavya that Kavi Kalash was an exponent and the spiritual teacher of the Shakti cult. At Shringarpur, he related Yuvaraj Sambhaji about his relationship in the previous birth, and goaded Sambhaji to perform the Kalashabhisheka according to the Shakti cult. Kavi Kalash also explained to Yuvaraj Sambhaji as to how on the basis of their relationship of the previous birth, they have become as the Siddha-Sadhaka (Teacher-Pupil).[120] While narrating that the poet of

---

120. Paramanandakavya, Section I, Verses 62-70,Pp.9-10.

the Paramanandakavya has called Kavi Kalasha as the "Chhandogamatya Mantri."[121] This is because the poet has composed the Paramanandakavya after Sambhaji had become the ruler and had made Kavi Kalasha as his Chhandogamatya Mantri.[122] That expression about Kavi Kalash does not indicate that he was a Chhandogamatya Mantri in Shivaji's Svarajya at the time when Sambhaji was at Shringarpur from October, 1676 onwards.

The above matters which have been related in the Paramanandakavya about Sambhaji and Kavi Kalash, clearly show that Sambhaji was acting against Shivaji at Shringarpur according to the calumnious suggestions of Kavi Kalash.[123] As a result, when such a person, who had no training or experience in the matters of the state craft, and who, being from North India had no competent knowledge about things in the Svarajya, was introduced in his Council of Ministers by Sambhaji as the Chhandogamatya; one can very well understand the feelings of the other Ministers of Sambhaji, who had by honest exertions and patriotic aspirations helped Chhatrapati Shivaji not only in establishing the Svarajya, but also in making it a fine political entity in India. Those

---

121. Ibid., Verse 65, p.10.
122. Shejwalkar, T.S., Paramanandaputrakrita 'Anupurana' Kavyachen Parikshana, (Shiva Chhatrapati, p.131, 138.)
123. Shejwalkar,T.S., Shivaji-Sambhaji Sambandha, (Shiva Chhatrapati, p.145).

Ministers and the patriotic subjects of the Svarajya who had loved Chhatrapati Shivaji and his noble ideals more than their own lives, must have thought it a foregone conclusion that Kavi Kalash, who was a self-seeking, evil-minded, unscrupulous mediocre person in the skilful matters of the policy and governance of the Svarajya, would not be able to put Sambhaji on the path of proper action by his advice.

Bendre has expressed that as the Chhandogamatya, of Sambhaji, Kavi Kalash, was required to carry out the work which was executed formerly by the Panditrao (Minister for Religion) under Shivaji in the government of the Svarajya.[124] Since there does not exist at present any document of the period of Sambhaji in which Kavi Kalash has been mentioned as the Panditrao of Sambhaji, we cannot accept this contention of Bendre.

Kavi Kalash was not only an inexperienced person in the matters of the state craft but he was also a man of a sectarian spirit and an avowed adherent of the Shakti cult. That Kavi Kalash was not a broad-minded person is proved clearly on the basis of the evidence stated by Kamal Gokhale.

That evidence points out that " when Sambhaji had started his rein, Bahiro Vitthal Lonkar went to his court with one Brahmana and two other persons. He requested

---

124. Bendre - Sambhaji, p.133.

the Peshwa, the Surnis and other ministers of Sambhaji that those two persons be given some employment. They all told Bahiro Vitthal Lonkar, "In this kingdom (of Sambhaji) entreaty on behalf of other (on our part) wont work. All the entreaty on behalf of others is given to Kavi Kalash Kabjibaba (Therefore), You go to him. Give him money for his expenses (Uparjana) and he will arrange for employment". But Bahiro Vitthal Lonkar did not go to Kavi Kalash when he learnt that Kavi Kalash had made it a rule that a person who will come to seek employment will have to go through an expiation (prayaschitta) at his hands and then will have to dine with him by taking the food cooked by his (Kavikalash's) wife. After that, Bahiro Vitthal Lonkar tried to secure employment for those persons by meeting Chhatrapati Sambhaji in a mountain pass when Sambhaji was on his way to go to Gangoli."[125]

This evidence clearly proves that Sambhaji had not continued the pattern of the administration of Shivaji but had created in the Svarajya only a facade of the Council of Ministers on the lines of Chhatrapati Shivaji which apparently was to be manned by his trusted, tried, honest and patriotic ministers or their successors under

---

125. Sambhaji, Pp.352-353. Gokhale has stated this evidence on the basis of an unpublished research paper read by Y.N. Kelkar in one of the meetings of the Bharata Itihasa Samshodhaka Mandala, Poona. That paper is in the records of the Mandala.

Sambhaji. In it, the Peshwa (the Prime Minister), who, according to the constitutional usages was only next to the Chhatrapati in the Svarajya, had no say even to recommend persons for ordinary jobs. The evidence also throws a ~~foild~~ flood of light on the treatment of insignificance which Sambhaji gave to other important ministers of Finance and other portfolios of his ministry, and to what high value and importance he held Kavi Kalash, the Chhandogamatya. It was, therefore, natural for the ministers of Sambhaji to feel dissatisfaction about the methods of his administration and his dependence on Kavi Kalash, who was an unqualified person to become a minister.

On the matter of giving the work of the Chhandogamatya to Kavi Kalash by Sambhaji, V.S. Bendre has expressed confused and perplexing views. In his work on Chhatrapati Shivaji,[126] where as he says that since the time of the coronation of Shivaji, Kavi Kalash was with him as a Samavedi Pandit, in his work on Sambhaji[127] he states that "Sambhaji gave the post of Chhandogamatya to Kavi Kalash to whom Chhatrapati Shivaji had earlier appointed on that post". Since V.S. Bendre has not stated any evidence to support his contention that Kavi Kalash was appointed to the post of

---

126. Bendre - Shivaji, II, p.1059.
127. Bendre - Sambhaji, p. 163.

the Chhandogamatya by Shivaji and the extant documents of the period of Chhatrapati Shivaji do not support that view, we cannot accept it in the history of Sambhaji.

It is seen from the various documents of Kavi Kalash[128] that he had the title "Chhandogamatya". From the extant sources we do not come to know as to when did Chhatrapati Sambhaji bestow the title 'Chhandogamatya' on Kavi Kalash. It is possible that it might have been bestowed upon him when Sambhaji started his rule and formed his Council of Ministers.

The title "Chhandogamatya"held by Kavi Kalash under Chhatrapati Sambhaji has been variously interpreted by the scholars upto now.

G.S. Sardesai[129] feels that the title Chhandogamatya cannotes that Kavi Kalash was a learned scholar in the Vedashashtra (Science of the Vedas).

R.V. Herwadkar[130] to explain the meaning of Chhandogamatya has expressed the opinion that the word Chhandogamatya is made up of Chandoga + Amatya. From that he has given its meaning as "one (the person) who recites the Sama-Suktas, i.e., the Panditrao".

Herwadkar's contention that the word Chhandogamatya means the Panditrao is not correct. For, we do not find

---

128. No.126, p.39; No.251, p.183 (BISMQ, XXX, Nos.1-2.).
129. Sardesai - Sambhaji, p.32.
130. Chitnis - Shivaji Bakhar, p.220, F.N.1.

in the extant documents of the period of Chhatrapati Sambhaji that Kavi Kalash was ever mentioned as the Panditrao either by others or by Kavi Kalash himself. As is seen from the extant documents of Sambhaji's period[131] it was Moreshwar Raghunath who acted as the Panditrao of Sambhaji at least upto 1686.[132] G.S. Sardesai[133] feels that after 1686, probably Kavi Kalash did the work of the Panditrao. But on the basis of the data of the Paramanandakavya V.S. Bendre[134] has correctly shown that after Moreshwar Raghunath, it was Keshav Pandit who acted as the Panditrao in the rest of the reign of Chhatrapati Sambhaji. It is, therefore, not correct to contend that the title Chhandogamatya connotes the meaning of the post of the Panditrao in the Council of Ministers of Chhatrapati Sambhaji.

We feel that the correct dissolution of the compound 'Chhandogamatya' is Chhandasa gachhati Sah Chhandogah (a person who acts or behaves (works) according to the Chhanda; that is, wish, desire, or whim, and Chhandogah Amatyah Iti Chhandogamatyah; that is, (the Minister, who acts or behaves (works) according to the wish, desire, or whim (of the king).[135]

---

131. Rajwade Khanda VIII, No.40,Pp.36-38;No.35,p.11; No.36,p.11 (BISMQ XXX, Nos.1-2).
132. Bendre-Sambhaji,p.131.
133. Sardesai-Sambhaji, p.33.
134. Bendre-Sambhaji,p.131; Paramanandakavya, Section IV, Canto VII,Verse 15,p.152.
135. I am very much indebted to Prof.A.R.Kulkarni of the Sanskrit Department, Kirti College, Dadar(Bombay-28) for having given me this possible dissolution of the word 'Chhandogamatya' on the basis of the original sanskrit word Chhandas (a Neutar).

In the light of the meaning given above of the title "Chhandogamatya", it is construed that by granting it to Kavi Kalash, Chhatrapati Sambhaji wished to get the work of his various ministers done through him according to his (Sambhaji's) Chhanda (desire or whim).

This contention is approved historically when we take into account some of the documents of the reign of Chhatrapati Sambhaji which show the different types of work Kavi Kalash has done in the Maratha administration under Sambhaji.

The documents of the reign of Chhatrapati Sambhaji show that Kavi Kalash asked the Desai of Prant Shirale to pay the arrears of money which the Desai was required to pay in the Maratha treasury;[136] Kavi Kalash also requested Sambhaji to grant the things which Bakaji Navadkar had asked for, and promising Bakaji about a fair treatment, wrote to Bakaji to see Sambhaji as it was Kalash's desire that all the Vatandars should unite and fight against the Mughals;[137] Kavi Kalash went with Prince Akbar, the rebel son of Aurangzeb, who was given asylum by Sambhaji to effect truce with the Portuguese of Goa with whom Sambhaji had a war;[138] Kavi Kalash also issued a letter of granting 50 hons per year in order to supply flowers and oil for lamps to the

---

136. SCS Khanda-III, No.64, p.235.
137. No.126, (BISMQ XXX, Nos. 1-2, Pp.39-40).
138. Jedhe Shakavali, p.33.

Hazrat Pir Abdulllakhan at Fonda, which the persons in the Fonda fort had vowed to that Pir for earning victory against the Portuguese at the time when the Portuguese had attacked that fort, and had after the victory requested Sambhaji to give money to that Muslim sacred place to fulfil their vow;[139] and in a quarrel between the claimants for a vatan, Kavi Kalash gave the ruling that "it was the decision of Chhatrapati Sambhaji that a person who is enjoying a vatan for 30-35 years is its real vatandar; and others, who have not enjoyed it during that period, cannot have claim upon it."[140]

These matters clearly establish the fact that Kavi Kalash did the work of different departments to carry out which through their respective departments, Sambhaji had other ministers in his Council of Ministers. When we find that there were other ministers in the Ministry of Sambhajito attend the work of a particular state subject, what we can infer from the above activity of Kavi Kalash is that he interferred in the work of other ministers according to the wish and consent of Sambhaji. From this it appears that Chhatrapati Sambhaji wished that by doing the work at times of different departments, Kavi Kalash should see that the work of his government is done according to the Chhanda (desire, wish or whim) of Sambhaji.

---

139. SCS Khanda VIII, No.46, p.50.
140. No.250, p.93, (BISMQ XXX, Nos.1-2).

Since Kavi Kalash appears to have been appointed by him as a minister(Amatya) to fulfil his objective of getting done the work of his Council of Ministers according to his Chhanda (desire, wish or whim), we feel that Sambhaji gave him the title "Chhandogamatya", i.e. a Minister who was to get the work of his Council of Ministers done according to Sambhaji's desire, wish or whim (Chhanda); and authorised him to do the work of various types and nature at different times in his reign. By that Kavi Kalash seems to have acted as a link between Chhatrapati Sambhaji and his Ministers in the Maratha government.

That Kavi Kalash acted as a link between Chhatrapati Sambhaji and his ministers is proved when the data of some of the credible documents of Sambhaji's reign is taken into account.

The letter of the Upadhyaye and Moreshwar Panditrao of 16th March, 1686,[141] addressed to the Deshmukh, Deshpande, Jyotishi, Upadhyaya and the learned scholars in the Vedas of Kasaba Harsul, Prant Aurangabad and all the Deshastha learned scholars in the Konkan, which formed the part of Maharashtra (Svarajya), shows that about Gangadhar Raghunath Kulkarni of Kasaba Harsul, who was forcibly converted to Islam by the Muslims when

---

141. Rajwade Khanda VIII, No.40, Pp.36-38.

he was in the Mughal service, and who wanted to get converted back to Hinduism, it was Kavi Kalash, and not Moreshwar Panditrao, who talked to Chhatrapati Sambhaji, even though that matter was in the jurisdiction of the work of Moreshwar Raghunath, the Panditrao of the Council Ministers of Sambhaji. The document clearly states that when Chhatrapati Sambhaji permitted the conversion of Gangadhar Raghunath Kulkarni, Moreshwar Panditrao and others attended the meeting of the Chhandogamatya (Kavi Kalash) and got Gangadhar Raghunath Kulkarni converted to Hinduism. Actually, that meeting should have been held or called, according to the proper procedure by Moreshwar Raghunath, who was the Panditrao in the Ministry of Sambhaji.

Similarly, the letter of Pralhad Niraji, the Nyayadhish (The Chief Judge), written to Gangaji Dadaji Subhedar and Karkun of Prant Rajapur, of 6th January, 1688,[142] shows that the quarrel about the Deshmukhi Vatan of Devarikh between Timaji Kanhoba and Ramaji Govind was listened to by the Chhandogamatya (Kavi Kalash) and settled by him. The purport of that document shows that even when Pralhad Niraji was the Nyayadhish in the Ministry of Sambhaji, he did not settle that dispute himself (as the proper working of the judicial department of the government of Sambhaji would have required it). As the

---

142. No.250, p.83, (BISMQ XXX, Nos.1-2).

Nyayadhish of Sambhaji what Pralhad Niraji has done in that document of his is only that he communicated to the parties concerned as to how that dispute was resolved by the Chhandogamatya (Kavi Kalash) on the basis of the decision which Chhatrapati Sambhaji had given to settle the right of a person to the Vatan.

The letters cited above of Moreshwar Raghunath Panditrao and of Pralhad Niraji Nyayadhish clearly prove the fact that though they had their respective ministerial posts in the Council of Ministers of Sambhaji, and they also wrote under their seal the letters of the decisions of the departments under them to others; those decisions were not taken by them, but those were taken by the Chhandogamatya (Kavi Kalash). From that it is clear that Sambhaji gave up the procedure of the work of every Minister and the department under him which Chhatrapati Shivaji had settled[143] for the smooth and efficient functioning of the Maratha government in the Svarajya.

Some of the data presented above of the role which Kavi Kalash played in the administration of Chhatrapati Sambhaji from the very beginning of his reign, supports the view expressed by different scholars[144] that "the Chhandogamatya was a separate post of a minister created by Chhatrapati Sambhaji in his Council of Ministers for Kavi Kalash".

---

143. Pradhan Va Itar Mulaki Va Lashkari Ammaldar Yanche Kamabaddal Kanu Jabate,(Sanads and Letters,Pp.122-132).
144. Sardesai-Sambhaji, p.32; Chitrav,Siddheshwar Shastri, Bharatavashiya Madhyayugin Charitra Kosh, p.209.

This controverts the purport of the view expressed by Kamal Gokhale[145] that Chhatrapati Sambhaji had not created an additional or separate post of the Chhando-gamatya in his Council of Eight Ministers because she finds in the Bakhar of Shivaji written by Malhar Ramrao Chitnis[146] that "on the occasion of the Coronation ceremony of Chhatrapati Shivaji, to the Northern side(of Shivaji, who was seated on the throne), stood Chhando-gamatya Pradhan Raghunath Panditrao with a vessel of Gold containing honey".

It is pertinent to note in this connection that Krishnaji Anant Sabhasad, who was a contemporary of Shivaji and who must have seen the coronation ceremony of Chhatrapati Shivaji himself, does not mention in his Bakhar of Shivaji that there existed in the Eight Ministers of Shivaji (who had taken their positions in the eight directions of Shivaji's throne at the time of that ceremony) that anyone of them was designated as the "Chhandogamatya". Together with this, there does not exist any contemporary document or source of the period of Shivaji which mentions that there existed in the Council of his Eight Ministers any Minister who was "Chhandogamatya".

It becomes then a moot problem to decide as to why

---

145. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p. 351.
146. Chitnis-Shivaji Bakhar, p.220.

has Malhar Ramrao Chitnis called Raghunath Pandit as the Chhandogamatya Pradhan in his Bakhar of Shivaji which he has written in 1811 A.D.[147] while stating in it the Eight Ministers of Shivaji who were present around his throne at the time of his coronation ceremony when in none of the extant sources of the period of Shivaji tells us that Raghunath Pandit, the Panditrao of Shivaji, had also an additional title as the "Chhandogamatya".

A clue to know that can be found if we take into accout the full title which Chhatrapati Sambhaji had bestowed upon Kavi Kalash according to Chitnis himself. Chitnis tells that Sambhaji had bestowed upon Kavi Kalash the title "Chhandogamatya Kavi Kalash Panditrao".[148] We feel that in this title of Kavi Kalash the word Panditrao is an appellation to indicate that Kavi Kalash was "a learned scholar" (a renowned Pandit), and it does not indicate that Kavi Kalash held the post of the "Panditrao" (a Religious minister) in the Council of Ministers of Sambhaji. This contention is proved by the fact that it was Moreshwar Raghunath who was the actual official Panditrao (Minister for Religion) of Sambhaji upto 1680; and after him, it was Keshav Pandit, who acted in that capacity throughout the reign of Sambhaji.[149] This

---

147. Apte,D.V., Shivaji Maharajanchi Khari Janmatithi, (Shiva Charitra Pradip, Pp.258-259); Chitnis-Shivaji Bakhar,p.1,F.N.1).
148. Chitnis-Sambhaji Bakhar, p.27.
149. Bendre-Sambhaji, p.131.

contention is strengthened by the fact that in the extant sources of the period of Sambhaji there is no mention of Kavi Kalash acting as the Panditrao (Minister for Religion) of Sambhaji.

It, therefore, appears that Malhar Ramrao Chitnis does not seem to have taken these facts into account. And because he found that Kavi Kalash was styled as the Chhandogamatya together with the appellation Panditrao; he seems to have presumed that the Panditrao (the Minister for Religion) was also the "Chhandogamatya" and hence while writing about Raghunath Pandit, the Panditrao (the Minister for Religion) of Shivaji, he wrote for him the title "Chhandogamatya" in his Bakhar of Shivaji.[150]

Having not taken into account as shown above, as to why has Malhar Ramrao Chitnis called Raghunath Pandit, the Panditrao (Minister for Religion) of Shivaji also as the "Chhandogamatya"; Kamal Gokhale has expressed the view whose purport is to convey that since in the Council of Ministers of Shivaji there existed the post of the Minister (Panditrao) who was called as the "Chhandogamatya", it is not that in his Council of Ministers Sambhaji had created an additional new Minister as the "Chhandogamatya".[151] In the light of the above discussion, her contention, that Sambhaji did not create a new post of the Minister

---

150. Chitnis-Shivaji Bakhar, p.220.
151. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.351.

known as the "Chhandogamatya" does not appear to be sound. The "Chhandogamatya" was certainly a new Minister created by Chhatrapati Sambhaji in his Council of Eight Ministers with a definite purpose, namely, to get the work of his other Ministers done according to his own "Chhanda" (desire, wish, whim) through that Minister. This explains the mystery as to why do we find in the documents of Ministers of different departments of Sambhaji usually the name of Kavi Kalash, the "Chhandogamatya".

It is then clear that the "Chhandogamatya" was a Minister newly created by Sambhaji, who superceded the jurisdiction of other Ministers and that he took part in their work, or at times guided the work of those Ministers as a representative of the king (Sambhaji) in the Maratha government of the Svarajya during the reign of Chhatrapati Sambhaji.

Thus to manage the Svarajya, Sambhaji established his Council of Ministers as shown above. The tragedy of Chhatrapati Sambhaji lay in fact that since he had not become the master of the Svarajya by fair means, he developed a curious psychology which appears to have led him not to trust his experienced Ministers but to depend on his mediocre minister Kavi Kalash to manage the skilful matters of his State.[152] As Sambhaji was not a straight-

---

152. Gokhale - Sambhaji, Pp.353-354.

minded ruler who did not try to remove doubts about his earlier anti-Svarajya activities, he, as well as his Ministers, other than Kavi Kalash, were suspicious about each other.

In that atmosphere charged with suspicion and doubts, Sambhaji performed his coronation ceremony on 16th January, 1681,[153] and became a full-fledged sovereign of the Svarajya.

---

153. Jedhe Shakavali, p. 31; Shivapur Daftaratil Yadi, p.53; Chitnis - Sambhaji Bakhar, Pp.11-12.

Chapter VI

WAR WITH THE MUGHALS

(1680 - September, 1683 A.D.)

The war with which Chhatrapati Shivaji was against the Mughals since 1670 had not ended with the death of Shivaji. Therefore, it was continued by Sambhaji during the period of his reign (1680-1689 A.D.).

At the time when Chhatrapati Shivaji expired (3rd April, 1680), emperor Aurangzeb was busy in his war against the Rajput States in Rajputana. In that war, a dangerous situation cropped up before him when his son, Akbar, after joining the Rajputs proclaimed himself as the Emperor of Delhi (See the section below - Asylum to Prince Akbar). In order to save himself in that calamity from the Rajputs and Akbar Aurangzeb invited Shah Alam (the Viceroy of the Deccan) and Dilerkhan (the assistant of Shah Alam) to Rajaputana for help and posted Bahadurkhan as the Viceroy of the Deccan in May, 1680.[1]

War In Baglan

In the Mughal-Maratha conflict the main theatre of war was Baglan, which was at that time a district under the Mughal administration of Khandesh, but which is now a part of the District of Nasik.

In 1638 A.D. when Baglan was ruled by a Rajput dynasty, the Mughals conquered it, and annexed it to the Mughal empire.

---

1. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha - Pagadi, Pp.75-76; Bendre-Sambhaji, Pp.216-217.

The strategic importance of the area of Baglan lay in the fact that through it a short and direct route towards the prosperous territory of Gujarat was available. This was realized by Shivaji during his raid of Surat. "Shivaji, therefore, struck at Baglan in 1670, and in the years following siezed the forts of Salher, Ahivant, Ramsej and finally Trimbakeshwar, a few miles from Nasik. The Mughals knew that Baglan under the Marathas would pose a perpetual threat to the Mughal provinces of Gujarat and Khandesh. It was their aim to clear the Marathas out of this ~~reign~~ region".[2]

Therefore, after reaching Aurangabad in May,1680, Bahadurkhan undertook an expedition to conquer the Maratha fortress of Ahivant (15 miles north of Dindori) on the Chandor range of hills in Baglan. In July,1680, he laid siege to Ahivant. But as the Maratha troops of that fort "made good resistance", Bahadurkhan could not conquer it. He then encamped in the neighbourhood of that fort for the rains.[3]

To this move of Bahadurkhan, which he had made in the rainy season, Chhatrapati Sambhaji did not give an immediate reply by making a counter move against the Mughals. However, he sent a word of defiance to Bahadurkhan that "he would give him battle in the open field after the rains".[4]

---

2. Pagadi-Maratha Mughal Relations, p.13.
3. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha-Pagadi, p.76; Sarkar-Aurangzib IV, Pp.243-244.
4. Sen-ERS-II, No.514,p.315;Sarkar-Ibid., p.244.

Accordingly, Sambhaji's armies were out after the Dasara, in the end of October, 1680, to proceed against the Mughals. With a well-conceived plan of strategy against the Mughals, he decided to send his one division, both horse and foot, towards Surat. The second division was to go towards Burhanpur. The third division was to keep Bahadurkhan in play and was to form a screen before his encampment near Aurangabad.[5]

The aims of Sambhaji in his war against the Mughals were (i) to carry out destruction in the Mughal territory, (ii) not to allow the concentration of the Mughal troops to take place against him; and (iii) to fight against the Mughals in the Baglana* in such a way that they will not be able to capture territory or the forts of the Svarajya from that direction.

The attacks of the Maratha troops in Khandesh (about 25th November) drew Bahadurkhan to Pardapur, and from there near Aurangabad in the pursuit of the Marathas.[6] When Bahadurkhan reached Khandesh, the Maratha troops withdrew from that territory.[7]

Sack of Burhanpur - January, 1681.

The Maratha division, which was on its way to Burhanpur, attacked the English factory of Dharangaon

---

5. Sarkar - Ibid.
* I am grateful to Shri.Setu Madhavrao Pagadi who has pointed these aims of Sambhaji to me.

6. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha-Pagadi, p.76.

7. Sarkar-Aurangzib IV, p.244.

and other towns in Khandesh.[8] After making a rapid dash, the Maratha troops under Sambhaji, fell on Burhanpur on 30th January, 1681[9] and sacked that city.

The description of that rich and populous capital of the Mughal Province of Khandesh has been given by Khafikhan, the Mughal historian, who was at that time posted as an Officer of the Guards patrolling on the Narmada river. Khafikhan has stated that "the Maratha attack came as a complete surprise to the Mughals. It was only when they saw the suburb of Bahadurpura on fire that Kakarkhan, the Chief Officer of the city, became aware of the approach of the Marathas. The Governor of Khandesh, Khan Zaman, was away. Kakarkhan, the Collector of Jaziya, was in charge of the city. He did not have more than two to three hundred horse while the Maratha forces consisted of nearly twenty thousand horse. Kakarkhan hastily closed the gates of the city, and made all possible arrangement for the defence of the city walls. The Marathas looted the rich suburbs of Hasanpura, Shah Gunj, Shah Jahanpura, Khurrampura, Namanpura and Bahadurpura for three days. Then laden with enormous booty, they withdrew and moved towards Baglana in the direction of the fort of Salher when they learnt that Bahadurkhan was coming for their pursuit from Aurangabad."[10]

---

8. Sarkar-Ibid., Pp.244-245; Gokhale-Sambhaji,p.235.
9. Sarkar-Ibid., p.245; Khafikhan-Pagadi,Pp.1-2.
10. Khafikhan-Pagadi, Pp.1-3; Pagadi-Maratha Mughal Relations, Pp.13-14.

When he got the news of the Maratha dash on Burhanpur Bahadurkhan made a forced march northwards from Aurangabad across the Kanner and Fardapur hills in order to reach Burhanpur early. "But his army suffered terrible privations from the roughness of the track, the abundance of jungles, and the many hills in the way. The camp-followers and transport cattle were footsore and lagged two stages behind the army. This unwise haste brought about its natural result. The whole force had to halt for two days to let the baggage come up. The enemy's horsemen, overloaded with booty, were sure to take the road to Salher as the forts of Konkan and the Sahyadri were to far off. Bahadurkhan ought, therefore to have hastened to Erandol and Chopada to intercept their flight. But after losing two days below Fardapur, he followed exactly the opposite direction and marched towards Edalabad and Burhanpur, long after the last named town had been evacuated by the enemy. The Marathas immediately took the open road west-wards and reached Salher in four or five days with all their prisoners and booty. Popular voice in the Deccan charged the Mughal viceroy (Bahadurkhan) with having been bribed by Sambhaji to follow this wrong strategy. The citizens of Burhanpur complained to the Emperor tothis effect and the Muslims threatened to stop their Friday prayers unless they were assured of the safety of their life and honour in future". When Aurangzeb learnt about the sack of Burhanpur by the Marathas, and about the complaint of the

residents of that city against Bahadurkhan, he censured Bahadurkhan for his negligence and withheld the promotion of his Mansab. Aurangzeb also ordered for the preparation of his march to Burhanpur after thinking about the destructive activity undertaken by the Marathas in the Deccan; and to pursue his rebel son, Akbar, who had taken to flight in the Deccan from Rajputana.[11]

In December, 1680, troops under Chhatrapati Sambhaji had reached near Sholapur. But those were defeated by Ranamastakhan and other Mughal commanders. Several persons from both the sides were killed in that battle.[12]

Maratha raid on Aurangabad - February, 1681.

While Bahadurkhan was away from Aurangabad, a Maratha force suddenly appeared before Aurangabad sometime in February, 1681. The idea about the danger which the Marathas had posed to that city has been given by Bhimsen Saxena in his autobiography, Tarikh-i-Dilkusha. Bhimsen was at that time a resident of Aurangabad and was serving under Bahadurkhan. He has stated that "Bahadurkhan was camping at Babhulgaon, sixteen Kos from Aurangabad. News was received at the end of a night that the Marathas were marching from the direction of Ahmadnagar and Paithan towards Aurangabad. Bahadurkhan made immediate arrangements to march away. He left a small detachment to guard his baggage ordering that

---

11. Khafikhan-Pagadi, Pp.3-4.
12. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.173, Pp.89-100.

it should be brought later. He himself with his force marched rapidly reaching Aurangabad the same day. It was well that he did so, otherwise a great disaster (to Aurangabad) would have taken place. News was received that the Marathas had spread in the suburb of Baipura and the village of Satara. Raja Anupsingh stood ready to guard his locality. He found it impossible to advance further. Bahadurkhan arrived hurriedly, but by this time they had advanced upto Baipura which they devastated. They, however, did not fight with Bahadurkhan but withdrew. Bahadurkhan camped near Jaswantsingh tank."

"I had my family with me. I reached Aurangabad in the noon. The scene that greeted me was extraordinary. People had shut their houses. Not a soul was to be seen in the market places or in the lanes. On the platform in the front of the Kotwali I could see only three soldiers sitting. After that Bahadurkhan stayed at Aurangabad. As ordered by Aurangzeb, he got constructed a protective wall around that city. That construction was completed in four months (about April, 1681) by Abdul Kadar, the son of Amanatkhan."[13]

"Throughout 1681, Maratha bands were moving about the province with Bahadurkhan making efforts to chase them away. They moved as far east as Indore (now Nizambad in Andhra Pradesh). Nearer home, they attacked Sholapur which was

---

13. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha-Pagadi, p.77; Pagadi-Maratha Mughal Relations, p.15; Massir-i-Alamgiri-Pagadi, p.24.

defended gallantly by Manohardas Gaur, They also attempted to raid Ahmadnagar. According to Jadunath Sarkar's statement based on the Akhbarat (news letters), Dilerkhan had captured a wife and a sister of Sambhaji and these were lodged in Ahmednagar. It is possible that when Sambhaji deserted to the Mughals in 1678 A.D. he was accompanied by a Natakshala (keep) and some female relatives. When Sambhaji escaped from the Mughals in 1679 A.D. his retinue was left behind. The women were removed to Ahmednagar while the male attendants were later executed under the orders of Aurangzeb in April, 1684."

"There was a running fight between the Mughals and the Marathas in the districts of Ahmednagar, Nasik and Aurangabad."[14] In April, 1681, the Maratha troops had gone to loot the territory around the fort of Naldurga. Those troops were defeated by Kalandarkhan, the Commander of that fort, and Ranamastakhan, the Mughal Commander.[15].

In July, 1681, the Maratha troops had gone to devastate the territory of Andur. They seem to have captured 2000 Mughal troops. The other Mughal troops pursued the Marathas and effected the release of those 2000 troops and their weapons.[16]

A detachment of 3000 troops was sent by Sambhaji to attack the fort of Purandar. But the Mughal commander,

---

14. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.276, Pp.156-157; Pagadi-Maratha Mughal Relations, Pp.15-16.
15. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.190, p.110; No.196, Pp.111-112.
16. Ibid., No.226, Pp.130-131.

Ranamastakhan defeated them. He, then set fire to several Maratha villages.[17]

In November, 1681, 2500 Maratha troops went in the territory of Ahmednagar. They ravaged and burnt the territory around the fort of Ahmednagar. The Mughal commander of Ahmednagar could not protect the city of Ahmednagar against their attacks. After that when those troops went to loot the Mughal territory around Bijapur, they were defeated by Bahadurkhan near Bijapur.[18] The Maratha troops had again gone in December, 1681, in the territory of Ahmednagar. Those troops were defeated by the Mughal commanders, Kulichkhan and Munavvarkhan.[19]

The Maratha troops used to collect the Chauth from the territory around Burhanpur. Those had also gone to loot the territory of Mulher in November, 1681.[20]

The Maratha army, which had penetrated in the territory of Salher, was defeated by Shiabuddinkhan.[21]

In December, 1681, Sambhaji had sent his 6000 troops to ravage the territory of Sholapur. The Mughal generals, Raja Manohardas Gaud and Ranamastakhan, and the troops of Bahadurkhan defeated those troops.[22]

The Maratha army constantly disturbed the territory around the fort of Parinda. This becomes clear from the

---

17. Ibid., No.257, p.145.
18. Ibid., No.269, Pp.152-153; No.271,Pp.153-154.
19. Ibid., No.282,Pp.161-162.
20. Ibid., No.272, Pp.154-155.
21. Ibid., No.280, p.160; No.281, Pp.160-161.
22. Ibid., No.289,p.159.

news received by Aurangzeb in December, 1681 , that because of the disturbances created in the territory around the fort of Parinda it was that the Mughal commander of fort Parinda, Suharabkhan, could not get any income from the Jahagir which Aurangzeb had given to him near that fort.[23]

Asylum to Prince Akbar - May-June,1681.

Prince Akbar was born to queen Dilrasbanu of Aurangzeb on 11th September, 1657.[24] Since Dilarasbanu expired when Akbar was hardly a child of one month, Emperor Aurangzeb very affectionately reared him up. As Aurangzeb gave him training in the military and civil matters through his renowned and seasoned commanders, Abkar became a well-trained prince. Sinee he behaved according to the inclinations of Aurangzeb and earned success in every undertaking, he enjoyed the confidence of emperor Aurangzeb.[25] But their happy relationship came to an end when Aurangzeb got involved in the Rajput war during 1679-1681.

The ruler of the Rajput state, Marwad(also known as kingdom of Jodhpur, as Jodhpur was its capital city), Maharaja Jaswantsingh died at Jamrud in Afghanistan on 10th December, 1678.[26] Since his son, Jaisingh had died in warfare earlier to him, after the death Jaswantsingh, there was no direct heir to the throne of the Jodhpur state.

---

23. Ibid., No.283, p.163.
24. Sardesai, G.S., Historical Geneologies, p.121; Sardesai-Sambhaji, p.24.
25. Sardesai-Sambhaji, p.24.
26. Ibid., Cambridge History of India IV, Index, p.646, the State of Marwad is also shown of the State of Jodhpur.

Immediately after the death of Jaswantsingh, Indrasingh, the grand son of his elder brother, Amarsingh (who was disinherited and banished from the kingdom by his angry-father), was the legitimate heir to the throne of Marwad (Jodhpur). Indrasingh was the Rao of Nagor and was a loyal grandee of the court of Aurangzeb. "If Aurangzeb had wished to preserve the life of the Marwad (Jodhpur) state, he had only to invest Indrasingh with the lordship of that state. But for more than five months after Jaswant's death no successor was appointed to his vacant throne. On the contrary, immediately on hearing of Jaswant's death, Aurangzeb took steps to seize his kingdom. Muslim officers were appointed as faujdar, qiladar, kotwal and Amin of Jodhpur and the whole country was brought under direct Mughal rule. On 9th January, 1679, the Emperor himself set out for Ajmer, in order to be close enough to Jodhpur to overawe opposition and direct the military operations that might be necessary. High officers, like the Wazir Asadkhan, Shaistakhan, and Prince Akbar, were summoned from their provinces to reinforce the Emperor at Ajmer".[27]

In February, 1679, two of Maharaja Jaswantsingh's wives gave birth to two posthumous sons. But, that did not affect Aurangzeb's policy of annexing the kingdom of Marwad.

On 12th April, 1679, having brought Marwad under his control, Aurangzeb returned to Delhi and imposed the Jiziya

---

27. Sarkar-Aurangzib III, Pp.216-217.

(Poll-tax) on the Hindus after more than a century of abeyance.[28]

Aurangzeb then sold the kingdom of Marwad to Indrasingh, the servile chieftan of Nagor, who was in the Mughal service hereditarily. Even though, a Rajput was installed on the kingdom of Marwad by Aurangzeb, the Mughal administrators and generals remained in it as Indrasingh did not enjoy the support of the local Rajputs. This was because the Rajputs of Marwad were in favour of the sons of the late Maharaja Jaswantsingh for the throne of Marwad.

In June, 1679, the family and the soldiers of Maharaja Jaswantsingh returned to Delhi from Afghanistan with his surviving infant son, Ajitsingh, the other son having died.

The Rajputs of Marwad then again pleaded the rights of Ajitsingh to the throne of Marwad before Aurangzeb. On that Aurangzeb ordered that Ajitsingh, who was a child, should be transferred to the imperial harem and promised to Rajputs that Ajitsingh would be installed on the throne of Marwad when he came of age. But the Rajputs suspected the inclinations of Aurangzeb. They thought that by keeping Ajitsingh in the imperial harem, Aurangzeb had the design of converting him to Islam. Therefore, the

---

28. Cambridge History of India IV, p.247.

Rajputs of Marwad determined to rescue Ajitsingh from the clutches of Aurangzeb by sacrificing their lives. In this matter they were inspired by Durgadas, the son of Askaran, the minister of Maharaja Jaswantsingh.[29]

Seeing the Rajput defiance to his order Aurangzeb decided to capture the two queens of Maharaja Jaswantsingh and his son Ajitsingh from Jaswantsingh's mansion in Delhi. On 25th June, 1679, when Aurangzeb sent his troops to capture Ajitsingh, a band of devoted Rajput soldiers of Marwad for a time drove back the imperialists. In that confusion, Durgadas siezed an opportunity to slip out with the queens and Ajitsingh from the mansion of Jaswantsingh. Eluding successfully the Mughal pursuit, Durgadas safely reached the kingdom of Marwad along with those queens and Ajitsingh. He then lodged them in a secure place of hiding in Marwad.[30]

When his attempt to capture Ajitsingh got foiled, Aurangzeb, in order to spread confusion in the Rajput ranks, brought up a milkman's infant in his harem as the true Ajitsingh by giving him the name Muhammadi Raj and proclaimed the child taken away by Durgadas from Jaswantsingh's mansion in Delhi as a bogus prince. He then deposed incapable Indrasingh and placed the kingdom of Marwad under the Mughal rule.[31]

---

29. Ibid.
30. Ibid., p.248.
31. Ibid.

To put down the Rajput opposition, Aurangzeb again went to Ajmer on 5th October, 1679, and sent Prince Akbar to reconquer the kingdom of Marwad. Though Marwad was completely occupied by the Mughal army which pillaged its towns and pulled down its temples, it was seriously opposed by the Rajputs, who always carried on a guerrilla warfare against it from the hills and deserts of Marwad. This was because the annexation of Marwad by Aurangzeb was regarded by them to be a preliminary step of his to the conquest of the kingdom of Mewad and then of all the other Rajput states in Rajputana. Sensing that danger and as Ajitsingh's mother was a niece of Maharana Rajsingh of Mewad, the kingdom of Mewad joined hands with the kingdom of Marwad to espouse the cause of the rights of Ajitsingh to the kingdom of Marwad against Aurangzeb. As a result of that Aurangzeb attacked the kingdom of Mewad. The Mughal army took possession of Udaipur, the capital city of Mewad. Occupying the famous fort of Chitod of Mewad, the Mughal army demolished Hindu temples. In that calamity, Maharana Rajsingh retired with all his subjects to the hills.[32]

Feeling that he had crushed the kingdom of Mewad, Aurangzeb returned from that state to Ajmer in March, 1680,

---

32. Ibid., Pp.248-249.

after keeping one strong army under prince Akbar in the kingdom of Mewad and the other army in the kingdom of Marwad. Aurangzeb felt that his hold on those kingdoms was completely established.

But in that presumption he proved to be incorrect. "The imperial outposts were too far scattered to be defended easily, and nearly the whole of Rajputana was seething with hostility. The Mughal positions in Mewad and Marwad were isolated from each other by the intervening Aravali rage, whose crest Rajsingh held in force and from which he could make sudden descents and surprise Mughal divisions on the east or the west as he pleased, while the Mughals in transferring troops from Chitod to Marwad had to make a long and toilsome detour".[33]

After Aurangzeb's return to Ajmir from Mewad, Prince Akbar, who was in charge of all the Mughal posts east of Aravali and south of Ajmer, was continuously harassed by the attacks of the Rajputs. They made raids and cut of supplies of the Mughal outposts with great prowess. In May, 1679, the Rajputs of Mewad even attacked the camp of prince Akbar itself. Soon after that they defeated Akbar and inflicted heavy losses to the army under him. As a result of his incapacity to meet the Rajput attacks, Akbar was transferred by Aurangzeb to Marwad from Mewad.

---

33. Ibid., p.249.

Aurangzeb then gave the command of Mewad to prince Azam.[34]

As Akbar failed to suppress the Rajputs of Marwad, Aurangzeb censured him from time to time for his military incapacity. When he saw no possibility to defeat the Rajputs, Akbar "lent a ready ear to the tempting invitation of the Rajputs to seize the Delhi throne with their help. The Maharana Rajsingh (of Mewad) and Durgadas (of ~~Mewad~~ Marwad) told the prince how his father's bigotted attempt to 'root the Rajputs out' was threatening the stability of the Mughal empire, and urged him to seize the throne and restore the wise policy of his forefathers if he wished to save his heritage from destruction. Theypromised to back him with the armed strength of the two greatest Rajputs clans, the Sisadias (of Mewad) and the Rathods (of ~~Mewad~~ Marwad)".[35]

Prince Akbar found the proposal of the Rajputs acceptable. But the execution of their plot against Aurangzeb got delayed as Maharana Rajsingh expired on 1st November, 1680, and was succeeded by his son, Jaisingh on the throne of Mewad. When Jaisingh promised support to Akbar against Aurangzeb, Akbar crowned himself as the emperor on 12th January, 1681, and started his march for Ajmer against Aurangzeb with the backing of the Rajput armies of Mewad and Marwad.[36]

Seeing the dramatic stand taken by prince Akbar against him, emperor Aurangzeb was bewildered. It had come up before Aurangzeb to face at the time when his main army units were not with him but had gone to carry out the work of his

---

34. Ibid.
35. Ibid., Pp.249-250.
36. Ibid., p. 250.

empire in its distant areas. Had prince Akbar straightway attacked him at Ajmer soon, Aurangzeb would have been defeated by him. "But Akbar was not the man to seize this opportunity by a rapid dash on the imperial camp; he began to spend his days in pleasure and took a fortnight to arrive near Ajmer." After that it was decided by Akbar that he would attack Aurangzeb on 26th January, 1681.[37]

Meanwhile prince Muazzam came from a distant place and joined emperor Aurangzeb with his army on 25th January, 1681. Some Mughal officers also deserted from the camp of Akbar to the camp of Aurangzeb. While preparing himself to face the attack of Akbar, Aurangzeb, on the 25th January, 1681, resorted to a cunning diplomacy which secured the completest victory for him against Akbar without any resort to arms.[38]

On the night of 25th January, 1681, Aurangzeb wrote a false letter to Akbar. In it, he praised Akbar "for having so successfully carried out the emperor's strategem of luring all the Rajput fighters within his reach, and now instructing him to place these Rajputs in his van in next morning's battle so that they might be easily crushed between the imperial forces and Akbar's own troops." This letter, as was planned by Aurangzeb,

---

37. Ibid., Pp. 250-251.
38. Ibid., p.251.

fell in the hands of Durgadas. After reading it, in surprise Durgadas went to Akbar's tent for an explanation. But it was reported that Akbar was asleep and his guards refused to wake him up. That led the Rajputs believe in the contents of the letter of Aurangzeb addressed to Akbar and they took measures to save themselves. "Three hours before dawn (of 26th January, 1681), they took horse, robbed what they could of Akbar's property, and galloped off to Mewad.Profitting by this confusion, the remaining imperial troopers whom Akbar had forced to accompany him escaped towards Aurangzeb's camp. In the morning Akbar awoke to find himself deserted by all, save a faithful band of 350 horse. He hurriedly rode away for life in the track of his Rajput allies, taking only some of his wives and children and a little treasure with him".[39]

Thus ended in a fiasco the attempt of Akbar to dethrone emperor Aurangzeb with the help of the Rajputs of Mewad and Marwad. For this fiasco, as can be seen from the facts stated above, Akbar's indolence, incapacity in tactful moves and lack of foresight were responsible. Due to these drawbacks in him it was that he missed the sure opportunity of causing the dethronement of Aurangzeb.

Durgadas soon discovered the trick played by Aurangzeb to cause the alienation of the Rajputs from

---

39. Ibid., Pp.251-252.

prince Akbar. He, then went to Akbar and took him under his protection and evading the pursuing Mughal troops, crossed Rajputana and Khandesh and brought Akbar in the Svarajya.[40]

Prince Akbar and Durgadas seem to have reached Trimbakeshwar sometime after 11th May, 1681, as can be gathered from the letter which Akbar has written to Sambhaji on 11th May, 1681, after he crossed river Narmada at Maheshwar (in Malwa) on 9th May, to reach the Svarajya.[41]

In his letter Akbar wrote to Chhatrapati Sambhaji as to how his discomfiture took place due to the deceptive letter written by Emperor Aurangzeb which alienated the Rajput supporters from him (Akbar).[42] In the letter, Akbar solicited the help of Sambhaji against Aurangzeb and promised him that if due to his support he (Akbar) would acquire the Empire of Aurangzeb, it will remain only in his (Akbar's) name but from real point of view of its working, it will be of Sambhaji. Praising the valour of Sambhaji, Akbar told him that he was coming to him in order to have his help to defeat Aurangzeb who was a common enemy of both of them.[43]

Chhatrapati Sambhaji does not seem to have given any reply to that letter of Akbar upto 20th May, 1681. This is clear from the letter which Akbar has written to

---

40. Ibid., p. 252.
41. Khutute Shivaji-Pagadi, Pp.62-64; Jedhe Shakavali, p.31; Sarkar-House of Shivaji, p.203.
42. Khutute Shivaji-Pagadi, p.63.
43. Ibid.; Chitnis-Sambhaji Bakhar, Pp.13-14.

Sambhaji on that date.[44] Chhatrapati Sambhaji does not seem to have replied even this letter Akbar.[45] This seems to be because the sudden coming of Akbar to him for asylum must have been thought by him as full of different grave complications in the fortunes of the Svarajya, whose master he had become on 20th July, 1680.[46] By performing his coronation ceremony on 16th January, 1681,[47] when Sambhaji had began his rule by effecting apparent reconciliation with Annaji Datto and other supporters of Rajaram, he seems to have felt perplexed when Akbar solicited asylum in the Svarajya. To give asylum to Akbar meant to enter in a prolonged war against Aurangzeb, whose strength in the military and the financial matters was tremendous in comparison with that of the newly founded Svarajya. In that, Chhatrapati Sambhaji had already undertaken the moves against the Siddis of Janjira, who were in the service of Aurangzeb since September, 1680,[48] to put an end to the menace of the Siddis to the Svarajya. To put an end to the menace of the Siddis to the Svarajya was very much necessary for the well-being of the Svarajya. As has been shown earlier, Aurangzeb was involved in the Rajput wars during that time and was not in a position to render effective

---

44. Ibid., p.64.
45. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.97.
46. Sambhaji Shakavali, p.104.
47. Ibid., p.106.
48. Ibid., p.104.

help to the Siddis of Janjira to defend themselves successfully against the attacks of Chhatrapati Sambhaji. Sambhaji, who had a training in the matters of the state-craft and diplomacy under his father, Shivaji, knew basically the problems of the Svarajya and, therefore, he seems to have been of the mind that he should put an end to the menace of the Siddis when Aurangzeb was not free to help the Siddis because of his entanglement in the Rajput war. In that, he knew, because of his association with Shivaji in matters of the Treaty of Purandar (1665) and in the custody of Aurangzeb at Agra, as to how the prominent Rajputs like Mirza Raja Jaisingh and Maharaja Jaswantsingh pursued a pro-Mughal policy and how they acted against the activity of Shivaji[49] by which Shivaji was trying to establish his political power in the Deccan. Taking into account the general attitude of the Rajputs, which was not favourable towards the Maratha political activity against the Mughals[50] and which Sambhaji had seen when he stayed in the camp of Jaisingh (1665) and when he visited the court of Aurangzeb daily when Shivaji was put under arrest in the custody of Agra by Aurangzeb, Sambhaji does not seem to have been inclined basically to give asylum to Akbar[51] who himself

---

49. Bendre-Sambhaji, p. 188.
50. Sarkar-House of Shivaji, Pp.130-133, shows the humiliation to which Jaisingh had put Shivaji before the treaty of Purandar(1665); Bendre-Ibid.
51. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.97.

was a lazy prince and who had taken an antagonistic stance against Aurangzeb only on the basis of the shaky and unreliable Rajput support. He, therefore, does not seem to have responded quickly to the letters addressed by Akbar to him.

Though initially Chhatrapati Sambhaji does not seem to have a mind to give asylum to Akbar, finally it seems that he gave it in annoyance due to the insistance of Kavi Kalash, who felt that "Sambhaji should take advantage of Akbar's coming to the Svarajya" (to play a political game against Aurangzeb).[52] This matter clearly proves that Chhatrapati Sambhaji was goaded in the matters of his state-craft by Kavi Kalash, who was an inexperienced person in those matters. The decision of Sambhaji to give asylum to Akbar and thereby of inviting a prolonged war against emperor Aurangzeb proved to be dangerous to the Svarajya.

Meanwhile as the Mughal troops were pursuing him, Akbar escaped from Trimbakeshwar and entered the Svarajya.[53]

---

52. Ibid., Reu, Pandit Vishveshvarnath, Marwad Ka Itihas I, Pp.271-272; States on the basis of the Ajitodaya, Sarga XI, Verses 27-29, that when Durgadas Rathod and Akbar reached the Svarajya (for asylum) Sambhaji could not make up his mind (to give asylum to them). But finally when Kavi Kalash convinced him (about giving them the asylum), he received them with great honour (gave them asylum). Ajitodaya is a Sanskrit poetic work of Bhatta Jagajivan. It is composed during the reign of Maharaja Ajitsingh, the son of Jaswantsingh (Ibid., p.21). Hence it is the work of a near contemporary to that event and that lends credence to his narration of the episode of the asylum ~~af~~ granted by Sambhaji to Akbar.
53. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha, Bagadi, p.78.

Chhatrapati Sambhaji seems to have sent his officers to receive Akbar. Those officers met Akbar and brought him at Pali in Konkan (25 miles north of Raigad, near Nagathana on the banks of river Amba) in the Svarajya on 1st June, 1681.[54] It seems that Akbar stayed at Padashahapur (to the South of Dhondase which is one mile to Pali) and Sambhaji had sanctioned money for his expemses.[55] It appears that with Akbar were Durgadas Rathod and 400 cavalry men, some infantry men and 50 camels.[56] It seems that Akbar had some camel troops also with him. This is proved by the fact that on 7th June, 1681, the commander of the fort of Salher (20 miles from Satana in Nasik District) defeated 400 camel-troops of Akbar in the territory of Salher and captured 20 servants of Akbar.[57] Seeing that Akbar had fled to the Svarajya, Aurangzeb, who was disturbed by the activity of Akbar, ordered Kartalabkhan on 15th June, 1681, that he should tell Ahmadkhan Navadi not to supply a ship to Akbar in Konkan and to arrest Akbar when he makes a public appearance.[58]

On 17th June, 1681, Harji Farjand, who was sent by

---

54. Sambhaji Shakavali, p.107; Sardesai-Sambhaji, p.27.
55. Gokhale-Sambhaji, Pp.97-98; Chitnis-Sambhaji Bakhar, p.17, however says that Akbar stayed at Dhandase, and as Akbar (who had declared himself as the Emperor-Padashaha) had stayed there, it was renamed as Padashahapur (Ibid., p.18)
56. Sambhaji Shakavali, Pp. 107-108.
57. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.210, p. 123.
58. Ibid., No.215, p. 125.

Chhatrapati Sambhaji with a letter and presents, handed over those to Akbar.[59] Akbar and Durgadas Rathod were below the fortress of Pali on 21st June, 1681, and around them were 300 soldiers of Sambhaji (probably for their protection and help).[60]

When Akbar was given asylum in the Svarajya, he became anxious to meet Sambhaji. But Chhatrapati Sambhaji did not see Akbar probably because he was watching the changes which were taking place in the political relationship of Aurangzeb with Maharana Jaisingh, the Rajput ruler of Mewad who was at war with Aurangzeb, and who had instigated Akbar to take a stand against Aurangzeb. For,"finding that Akbar had beaten a retreat to the territories of Sambhaji, Aurangzeb became desirous of concluding a peace with the Rana (Maharaja of Mewad). Aurangzeb was now eager to strengthen his position in the Deccan, fearing that Akbar would lose neither time nor opportunity in making himself formidable with the aid of Sambhaji. Thus in the very same region (Deccan) where he (Aurangzeb) began his contest for throne, Akbar would acquire peace, wealth and soldiers. The chief difficulty was, however, to make a peace with the Rana, for Aurangzeb could not make overtures without loss of honour. He also feared that the Rana and the nobles in his kingdom, as also his own

---

59. Sambhaji Shakavali, p.108.
60. Ibid.

officers, among whom were some friendly to the Rana, might mock at him for having refused the proferred peace, which he was now himself compelled to sue for".[61]

Chhatrapati Sambhaji, therefore, might have been curiously watching as to what the Rana of Mewad, was going to do when he received the proposals of peace from Aurangzeb, whose future had come in danger after when Sambhaji had given asylum to Akbar who was upto that time backed by the Rana of Mewad. If the Rana of Mewad was to continue his opposition to Aurangzeb and remain steadfast in his resolution to support the people of Marwad and Akbar and thereby Chhatrapati Sambhaji; Aurangzeb would have been required to fight against them at two fronts - one in Rajputana and the second in the Svarajya. In that event the situation would have been rather difficult for Aurangzeb as he would have been required to fight enemies at two fronts and it would have been favourable for Sambhaji particularly as Aurangzeb would have been compelled, in order to protect his territory, to remain in the North or the Rajputana, and he would not have been free to come down to the Deccan to deal with Akbar and Sambhaji. But in settling peace with the Rana of Mewad Aurangzeb proved to be lucky. The Rana of Mewad seems to have jumped with eagerness to seize the opportunity

---

61. Manucci-Storia Do Mogor II, Pp.235-236.

of settling peace with Aurangzeb as soon as it was offered as Mewad was "ravaged by war "[62] and thereby left the people of Marwad, Akbar and Chhatrapati Sambhaji in the lurch even though earlier he had staunchly supported Marwad and Akbar against Aurangzeb. The Rana of Mewad, to save his own state from ruin, conveniently finalised the terms of peace treaty with Aurangzeb on 24th June, 1681, and thereby even "ceded to the empire (Aurangzeb) the parganas of Mandal, Pur and Bednor in lieu of the Jiziya demanded from his kingdom",[63] though the Rajputs basically hated the payment of the Jiziya. By that time (24th June, 1681), Chhatrapati Sambhaji had succumbed to the pressure of Kavi Kalash and had already given asylum to Akbar and had thereby taken a stand in opposition to Aurangzeb. As now after concluding peace with the Rana of Mewad, posting his troops to hold the cities and strategic points of Marwad, whose people were still at war with the Mughals,[64] Aurangzeb personally was coming down to the Deccan,[65] fresh problems of strategy seem to have cropped up before Sambhaji and due to those it seems that Sambhaji did not visit Akbar for sometime when he was given asylum in the Svarajya.

There had also cropped up other matters of grave importance before Chhatrapati Sambhaji which were

---

62. Cambridge History of India, IV, p.252.
63. Ibid.
64. Cambridge History of India, IV, p.302.
65. Ibid., p. 281.

instrumental in preventing his visit to Akbar. Those matters were of the quarrels of the ministers of the Svarajya with Sambhaji during that time.

We get some idea of those quarrels from Manucci. Manucci says that "some of Sambhaji's officers (ministers) quarreled with him.... They signed a treasonable letter against their prince, in which they promised to join Prince Akbar, to whom the letter was sent. The latter (Akbar) was eager enough to make use of such a good opportunity, but he would not act without the advice of the (Rathod) leader Durgadas, to whom he confided the secret. Durgadas counselled him not to rely on such a letter, and said it was possible that Sambhaji was himself the originator of this fiction, in order to see whether he (Akbar) would countenance such a rebellion, or was in reality a prince grateful for the many favours done to him. The safe course would be to confide the said letter to Sambhaji himself and prove to him the fidelity and gratitude felt towards him".[66]

---

66. Manucci-Storia Do-Mogor II, p.241, Manucci is not correct in giving the period of the conspiracy which had taken place in the Svarajya against Sambhaji. He places it in the period after the arrival of Aurangzeb at Burhanpur. Whereas Aurangzeb had reached that place on 8th September, 1681 (Sambhaji Shakavali,p.108), the conspirators were arrested by Sambhaji before 30th Auguat, 1681, (Bendre-Sambhaji,p.190) and those were put to death by him by 2nd September, 1681, (Jedhe Shakavali, p.31). Manucci seems to have learnt about that conspiracy and its result after when Aurangzeb reached Burhanpur.

UNIVERSITY OF BOMBAY LIBRARY

By the time their conspiracy with Akbar against Chhatrapati Sambhaji came to be disclosed, it seems that those conspirators tried to poison Sambhaji who was at Panhala at that time.[67] The conspirators involved in these attempts against Sambhaji were Annaji Datto, Balaji Avaji Prabhu, Somaji Datto, Hiroji Farjand and Soyarabai, the mother of prince Rajaram. There were as many as 20 more persons involved in that conspiracy.[68] Out of them, Chhatrapati Sambhaji immediately seems to have arrested Annaji Datto, Balaji Avaji Prabhu, Somaji Datto and Hiroji Farjand near Parali before 30th August, 1681.[69] Sambhaji then put Annaji Datto, Balaji Avaji Prabhu, Somaji Datto and Hiroji Farjand to death.[70]

After putting to death Annaji Datto and others in October, 1681, Chhatrapati Sambhaji seems to have conducted an inquiry of the other surviving persons who were involved in a plot to poison him.[71] It does not appears that due to her involvement in that plot, Soyarabai, the mother of prince Rajaram, felt ashamed of her life and she committed suicide by hanging herself to death.[72] It does not appear, as is thought by G.S. Sardesai[73] that she died because of the

---

67. Bendre-Sambhaji, Pp.190-191.
68. Ibid.
69. Jedhe Shakavali, p.31.
70. Ibid.
71. Bendre-Sambhaji, p. 190.
72. Modak-Chhoti Bakhar, Pp.51-52; States about her suicide, though in 1680; Bhonsle and Peshava's Bakhar, p.48, States about her suicide, though in 1680.
73. Sardesai-Sambhaji,p.30; Bendre-Sambhaji,p.141, States on the basis of the unpublished English Records that Soyarabai did not commit suicide by poison.

administration of poison or by awarding inhuman treatment to her by Sambhaji. Taking into account the harmonious relations which Senapati Hambirrao Mohite had with Sambhaji and the zeal with which Hambirrao served him till the time of his (Hambirrao's) death in 1687, it appears that Sambhaji could not have a hand in the death of Soyarabai. Similarly it appears that Rajaram would not have much respect and affection which he showed throughout his life for Sambhaji, his queen Yesubai and son Shahu, had Sambhaji been in any way instrumental in causing the death of his mother, Soyarabai.[74]

After putting down the conspiracies against him, Chhatrapati Sambhaji became free to visit Akbar. In the episode of the conspiracies against him, Akbar had emerged as an honest friend of Sambhaji. In that, since by that time, Aurangzeb personally was advancing towards the Svarajya after becoming free from Rajput war to put down Sambhaji and Akbar, Chhatrapati Sambhaji had no alternative than to pursue his adherance to Akbar against Aurangzeb. For, even if he wanted now to withdraw asylum given to Akbar, he knew that Aurangzeb, when he was free personally from the Rajput war, will not spare him for the antagonistic stand he had taken against him (Aurangzeb) by giving asylum to Akbar earlier. Knowing this well, even

---

74. Joshi, P.S., Early Life of Chhatrapati Rajaram (1670-1689 A.D.), (QRHS, VIII, No.3, p.182).

when the Rana of Mewad had let down Akbar and thereby Chhatrapati Sambhaji; Sambhaji seems to have decided to do his best in order to oppose Aurangzeb within the given circumstances and face the consequences for the asylum he had given to Akbar.

Chhatrapati Sambhaji then visited Akbar at Padshahapur (Dhondase) on 13th November, 1681. Durgadas Rathod was also present at the time of their meeting.[75] Sambhaji seems to have visited Akbar again with Kavi Kalash at Gajapur.[76] This might have been with a wish to get acquainted Akbar closely with Kavi Kalash according to whose advice Sambhaji was managing the Svarajya and on the basis of which he was to act during the time of his conflict with Aurangzeb. It appears that when that purpose was attended, they sent off Akbar to some (unknown) place. Thereafter, Sambhaji returned to Raigad and sent Kavi Kalash to Panhala.[77]

Aurangzeb's arrival in the Deccan - November, 1681.

Meanwhile, emperor Aurangzeb, who had settled the terms of peace with the Rana of Mewad, took the route for Burhanpur from Ajmer on 8th September, 1681, in order to put down the combination of Akbar and Sambhaji against him. Earlier to that on 21st July, 1681, Aurangzeb had sent his second son, Azzamshah, against Akbar and Sambhaji to the Deccan. Azzamshah reached Burhanpur on 29th October, 1681,

---

75. Sambhaji Shakavali, p.209.
76. TKK I, No.322, p.470; Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.100, gives the name of that place as Rajapur. It does not appear to be correct.
77. TKK-I, Ibid.

and from there reached Aurangabad on 11th November, 1681.[78]

When Aurangzeb was on his way to Burhanpur, he had also sent Kilichkhan Kwaja Abid (the father of Shahabuddin alias Gazi Uddin Firozjung, and the grand father of the Nizamulmulk of Haiderabad) to the Deccan.[79]

Aurangzeb himself reached Burhanpur on 13th November, 1681,[80] the day on which Chhatrapati Sambhaji met Akbar at Padashahapur (Dhondase). All the military resources of the Mughal empire were concentrated by him in the Deccan. All his best generals were present to carry out his orders. His strong force occupied Rajputana and kept safe the road to Delhi.

Soon after his arrival at Burhanpur, Aurangzeb sent Hassanalikhan with 14000 troops to campaign in Konkan against Sambhaji.[81] He also ordered Bahadurkhan to move his camp from Aurangabad to Bahadurgad, which was on the bank of the river Bhima.

Seeing that Aurangzeb had come to the Deccan to direct personally his military operations against him, Chhatrapati Sambhaji also made military preparations. He deputed Rajaram to look after the management of different forts in the Svarajya with his experienced generals, Yesaji Patil Dabhade, Khandoji Dabhade and Shivaji Dabhade.[82]

---

78. Massir-i-Alamgiri - Pagadi, Pp.20-21.
79. Pagadi - Hindavi Svarajya Ani Mogal, p.25.
80. Massir-i-Alamgiri - Pagadi, p.21.
81. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.263, p.149.
82. Sane, K.N., (Ed.), Senapati Dabhade Va Gaikwad Yanchi Hakikat, p.1.

Aurangzeb and the Kingdom of Bijapur - 1681.

Chhatrapati Sambhaji had continued friendly relations which Shivaji had established with the kingdom of Bijapur.[83]

When Akbar was given asylum by Sambhaji, and Aurangzeb had decided to march to the Deccan to put down Akbar and Sambhaji, Aurangzeb wrote a friendly letter on 13th July, 1681, to Sarjakhan, the leading general of the kingdom of Bijapur. By that letter, Aurangzeb pressed Sarjakhan to co-operate with the Mughal generals in crushing Chhatrapati Sambhaji. He also told Sarjakhan to recover the former Bijapur territory which now formed a part of Svarajya. But that letter did not lead Sarjakhan or other Bijapur nobles to sever their relations with Chhatrapati Sambhaji.[84]

Strategy of Aurangzeb.

As has been pointed out, Aurangzeb arrived at Burhanpur on 13th November, 1681, to direct the Deccan campaign, and despatched Hassanalikhan in the Konkan. His strategy of the war against Sambhaji seems to be that while an army was to proceed towards Bijapur to overawe that state in order to prevent it from joining hands with the Marathas; Hassanalikhan was to descend into the Konkan against the Marathas. By that Aurangzeb seems to have felt that Hassanalikhan would effect the conquest of Konkan easily.

---

83. For the relations of Shivaji with the Kingdom of Bijapur, See - Sardesai-Shivaji,Pp.172-173;203-205.
84. Busatinussalatin-Parasnis-Bendre,Pp.582-584, 590.

This plan of Aurangzeb did not become successful. For, in the region of Baglana over-looking the Konkan, fierce battles were being fought between the Marathas and the Mughals, and the Marathas were in a position to have a number of forts in that area. Therefore, it was a mistake on the part of Mughals to descend into the Konkan at this stage without clearing Baglana from the Marathas.

As will be evident from the narration of the future events, though Hassanalikhan could penetrate in the Konkan, he had to return from it as he could not get provisions due to the absence of the line of communications between him and the main base of the Mughal operations.

Aurangzeb and the Kingdom of Golkonda - 1681.

There existed friendly relations between Chhatrapati Shivaji and the kingdom of Golkonda.[85] Those relations were also continued with Golkonda by Chhatrapati Sambhaji. The Sultana of Golkonda was also having friendly relations with the kingdom of Bijapur.

After coming to the Deccan in November, 1681, Aurangzeb asked Tanashah, the Sultan of Golkonda, to supply troops against Chhatrapati Sambhaji and Bijapur. By that he tried to separate Golkonda from the Svarajya and Bijapur. Aurangzeb also told Tanashah that he will attack Golkonda if the troops will not be supplied to him.[86]

---

85. Sherwani, H.K., History of the Kutbshahi Dynasty, Pp.634-638.
86. SCSK-II, No.394,p.396.

In spite of that threat, Tanashah decided to continue his friendship with Sambhaji and Bijapur. To that effect, Tanashah frankly replied to Aurangzeb by saying that "I do not consider that my kingdom is separate in any way from the other kingdoms in the Deccan. The interests of all of us are common and I regard that whatever happens to them will happen to my kingdom."[87]

Sambhaji's War Against the Siddis of Janjira-1680 to 1682.

The Siddis of Janjira who were in the employment of the Mughals, were a constant source of trouble to the territory of the Svarajya. They used to raid the territory of the Svarajya by taking shelter in the island of Bombay, which was possessed by the English. Shivaji made several attempts to check the destructive activity of the Siddis by fighting war against them. But the Siddis could not be reduced completely by him. To check effectively the raiding and destructive activity of the Siddis, Shivaji constructed the fort of Khanderi in the sea, 11 miles to the southern direction of Bombay. He also settled it with the English by a treaty in March, 1680, that the English will not allow the Siddis to winter in the (Bombay) harbour unless they promised to abstain from any depredations in the territory of the Svarajya.[88]

---

87. Ibid., Golkondyachi Qutubshahi - Bendre, p.131.
88. Banaji,R.D., Bombay and the Siddis, p.31. For an early account of the Siddis of Janjira - See, Banaji,R.D., Ibid., Pp.1-40. For the relations of Shivaji with the Siddis - See, Sarkar - Shivaji and His Times, Pp.245-275, Sardesai - Shivaji, Pp.246-256.

But that treaty of peace seemed to be of no use to stop the menace of the Siddis to the Svarajya. For, in April, 1680, the Siddis brought their vessels and soldiers against the wishes of the English at Mazgaon, and capturing some persons from the districts of the Svarajya, offered them for sale in the Bombay harbour. The English government discovered twenty-one of those unfortunate beings and at once released them.[89] The Siddis continued their disturbing activity on the island of Bombay in the subsequent month also.

As soon as Sambhaji became the Chhatrapati (20th July, 1680), he took swift steps against the menace of the Siddi to the Svarajya. The problem of tackling the Siddis of Janjira was a knotty and intricate one. As it was, the Siddis were the servants of the Mughal emperor Aurangzeb. To deny them the facilities they asked for stay at Bombay in the rainy season was difficult for the English. For, the English, who were enjoying trade facilities in the Mughal empire naturally felt that those facilities may be denied to them by Aurangzeb if they will not accommodate the Siddis of Janjira, who were in his employment. As a result, when they accommodated the Siddis on the island of Bombay, the Siddis used that as a facility to continue their antagonism against the Svarajya by attacking its territory.

---

89. Banaji, R.D., Ibid., p.32.

The English did not like those actions of the Siddis, and from time to time they demonstrated their objection to that effect to the Siddis. But in spite of that when the Siddis continued their hostile activity against the Svarajya, the English relations with the Marathas did not remain on good terms. Shivaji, who was a shrewed diplomat could understand very well the limitations which the English had in their dealings with the Siddis. As he was constantly involved in diplomatic manoeuvres against the Mughals, at times he could not pursue sternly the matters against the Siddis. When Sambhaji became his successor, he seems to have decided to put an end to the Siddis of Janjira probably because he found Aurangzeb entangled at that time in a war against the Rajputs and in it Aurangzeb was personally present in Rajputana from 9th January, 1679, onwards. As a result, there was no possibility of his becoming free from it in the near future and do something positive to help the Siddis if they were to be attacked by the Marathas. The time selected by Sambhaji, therefore, to put an end to the menace of the Siddis to the Svarajya was the most opportune and the sort of which was never afforded to Shivaji by destiny throughout his career.

Chhatrapati Sambhaji, therefore, seems to have taken to a vigorous offensive drive against the Siddis of Janjira. Along with warning the English not to give facilities to the Siddis on the island of Bombay, Sambhaji seems to have

taken a definite posture of war against the Siddis of Janjira in August, 1680. For, we learn from the English records[90] that before 18th August, 1680, two hundred Maratha soldiers attacked the island of Underi which belonged to the Siddis of Janjira. Their effort to capture that island proved to be a failure as they did not have proper knowledge of that island. In the skirmish which they had with the Siddis, eighty of them lost their lives. Chhatrapati Sambhaji continued his firm policy towards the English and told them not to help in any manner the Siddis of Janjira.[91] On 20th November, 1680, he sent his ambassador, Avaji Pandit to Bombay. Avaji Pandit told the English that if they will not observe properly their treaty, which they had concluded with Shivaji, and will continue to render help to the Siddis, Sambhaji would declare war against the English.[92] Seeing the firm attitude of Sambhaji, the English sent their men on 20th December, 1680, to tell the Siddis of Janjira that if they will continue to attack the Maratha territories, the English will have to give up friendly relations with them (Siddis).[93] After that Avaji Pandit returned to the Svarajya along with the gifts given by the English to Chhatrapati Sambhaji.[94]

---

90. SPSS II, No.2269,p.694.
91. Ibid., No. 2287, p.700, No.2293, p.701.
92. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.126.
93. Ibid., p.127.
94. Ibid.

In the meantime the Siddi of Janjira, who had gone to Vengurla, returned to Bombay in March, 1681. From there he proceeded to Surat. On his way to Surat he posted his five hundred soldiers and six ships at Underi. At the Mazgaon Port the Siddi had posted three hundred soldiers. Those soldiers again started their activity of attacking and looting the territories of the Maratha Svarajya. On 16th March, 1681, the Siddis captured the two Maratha ships and from them four persons who were bound for Bombay. The Maratha officer, who had an army of three thousand soldiers under him at Cheul, demanded the return of the Maratha ships and the captured persons by the Siddis to the English. The English then obtained those ships and the men from the Siddis and returned those to the Marathas.[95]

After the failure of the Marathas in August, 1680, in order to capture the island of Underi from the Siddis, Chhatrapati Sambhaji made fresh preparations. At Nagothana, he posted 22 Maratha ships with three thousand Maratha naval troops. He promised to give two seers of gold to every soldier who would exert to capture the island of Underi from the Siddis.[96]

Having made the preparations well, the Marathas led an assault on the island of Underi on 18th July, 1680. But the Siddis foiled their attack.[97]

---

95. Ibid., p.128.
96. Ibid.
97. Ibid.

In October, 1681, the English of Bombay allowed the Siddi of Janjira to stay at Bombay on the condition that he will not indulge in the activity of attacking the Maratha territory. In spite of that agreement with the English, in December, 1681, the Siddi looted and burnt the towns of Apte and Nagothana[98] of the Svarajya.

These activities of the Siddis of Janjira very much annoyed Chhatrapati Sambhaji. To put an end to the menace of the Siddis, he decided to conquer the fort of Janjira.

In the beginning, knowing well the impregnability of the fort of Janjira, Chhatrapati Sambhaji tried to capture it by deceit. He, therefore, sent Kondaji (Khanduji)[99] Farjand in the employment of the Siddis of Janjira. It was planned by them that after securing employment under the Siddis, Kondaji (Khanduji) should, at a convenient time, set fire to the ammunition of the Siddis in the fort of Janjira and should try to cause defection in the camp of the Siddis.[100] After that it seems that Sambhaji was to attack that fortress and capture it.

Accordingly, Kondaji (Khanduji) Farjand secured an employment under the Siddis and started staying with his men and their families in the fort of Janjira. But his

---

98. Ibid., p.129.
99. Chitnis-Sambhaji Bakhar, p. 17, F.N. 48. Shri. Sane, the Editor, points out that according to Grant Duff he was Khanduji Farjand.
100. Chitnis-Ibid., p.17.

foul design against the Siddis was detected and the Siddis put many of them to sword.[101]

As he became unsuccessful in capturing the fortress of Janjira by deceit, Chhatrapati Sambhaji, with twenty thousand Maratha troops besieged that fortress in December, 1681. At that time prince Akbar was with Sambhaji. Those troops bombarded the walls of the fortress of Janjira for fifteen days. As a result, when in those walls wide gaps got created, the Siddis, to face the Maratha assault, took shelter behind the rocks of the hills of Janjira on 3rd January, 1682.[102]

From 3rd January, 1682, to 3rd February, 1682, Chhatrapati Sambhaji constantly attacked the fortress of Janjira. But still the Siddis held their own against the Marathas. When the Marathas were exerting heavy pressure upon the Siddis and were likely to capture Janjira, Chhatrapati Sambhaji was required to withdrew himself from the siege of Janjira leaving the task to his generals and go to combat against the Mughal army, which had advanced on the Ghats in the Svarajya under Nabab Hassanalikhan, the commander of Aurangzeb.[103]

Due to the withdrawal of Sambhaji from the siege of Janjira, the Maratha vigour to capture that fortress from

---

101. Ibid., Pp.17-18.
102. Sambhaji Shakavali, Pp.109-110.
103. Ibid.

the Siddis gradually fizzled out. Somehow, it appears, that the efforts to capture Janjira were made by the Marathas under Dadaji and Visaji Raghunath Deshpande, the Maratha generals, kept by Chhatrapati Sambhaji for that purpose.[104] But the Maratha attempts to conquer Janjira were foiled by the Siddis. As a result, finally,in August, 1682, Ddaji Raghunath Deshpande was required to lift up the siege of Janjira as probably he was required by Chhatrapati Sambhaji to fight against the Mughals else where and to certain extent, as Sambhaji found it difficult to defray the expenses of his war against the Siddis.[105]

After the withdrawal of the Maratha troops from the Janjira front in August, 1682, the Siddis continued to attack sporadically the Svarajya territories upto the end of the reign of Chhatrapati Sambhaji. As Sambhaji was entangled in his war against the Mughals, even though his naval commanders like Siddi Misri, Daulatkhan, Mayanak Bhandari, Santaji Pavala, Govindaji Jadhav, Govind Konho[106] and others, exerted to face the attacks of the Siddis on the Svarajya, they were not successful in putting an effective check on the destructive activity of the Siddis.

Thus even though fortune had offered Sambhaji a golden opportunity to put an end to the menace of the

---

104. Aitihasik Sadhane-Avalaskar, No64,p.99; Chitnis-~~Bakhar~~ Sambhaji Bakhar, p.19.
105. Chitnis-Ibid.; Gokhale-Sambhaji, Pp.131-133.
106. Chitnis-Ibid., Pp.10-20.

Siddis of Janjira, he lost it because of his unwise policy by which he gave asylum to prince Akbar, and thereby hastened the coming of Aurangzeb with his full strength on the Svarajya.

Mughal incursions in the Svarajya (1682).

In 1682, Aurangzeb ordered Abu Mahammad, who was well acquainted with the topography of the Deccan to let him know about the condition and the nature of the ghats and passes in the hills and the mountains in the Svarajya. Accordingly, Abu Muhammad told Aurangzeb that there existed 360 ghats and passes in the territory of the Svarajya, and out of those, 65 were such that through these elephants and camels could pass; whereas the remaining passes were narrow.[107] This shows that Aurangzeb was well aware about the difficulties which he was to encounter in his Deccan campaign.

Hassanalikhan, to whom Aurangzeb had sent to campaign in Konkan against Sambhaji, captured the town of Kalyan on 30th January, 1682, after facing successfully the opposition of the Marathas. As a result of that Sambhaji leaving his commanders to continue the siege of Janjira came to Raigad to check that Mughal advance in the Svarajya. Due to lack of provisions and the resistance of the Marathas, he was required to withdraw from that

---

107. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.360,p.211.

place sometime in May, 1682.[108]

In the beginning of 1682, Aurangzeb ordered Bahadurkhan to settle his base at Bahadurgad and to deal with the attacking Maratha bands in that territory. Then Bahadurkhan sacked the Maratha town of Shivapur (midway between Poona and Shirval).[109]

From Burhanpur, Aurangzeb arrived at Aurangabad on 22nd March, 1682.[110]

On 20th May, 1682, Sharifkhan went out to forage when the Maratha troops appeared. He fought a severe battle against them and slained many of them. In that battle, Zahidkhan, Churaghasi and Saifullah and Ahsanullah, grandsons of Saidkhan were killed.[111]

Aurangzeb sent Ruhullahkhan to chastise the Maratha troops near Ahmednagar on 23rd May, 1682. On 14th June, Aurangzeb sent prince Azzam towards Bijapur. Prince Azzam was accompanied by his son, Bedar Bakth.[112]

On 30th August, 1682, Bahadurkhan was sent to Nasik by Aurangzeb. He also ordered prince Muizuddin(son of prince Muazzam) on 28th September, to proceed to the territory of Ahmednagar to put down the attacking Maratha troops. Ranamastakhan, Daudkhan, Gazanfarkhan, and other officers were ordered by Aurangzeb to accompany him.[113]

---

108. Pagadi-Maratha Mughal Relations, p.23; Jedhe Shakavali, p.31.
109. Sarkar-Aurangzib IV, p.256.
110. Massir-i-Alamgiri-Pagadi, p.7.
111. Pagadi-Maratha Mughal Relations, p.23.
112. Ibid.
113. Ibid., Pp.23-24.

Operations in Baglana.

" Thus in the year 1682, the Mughal Generals, Prince Azzam and Dilerkhan were operating on the Bijapur and Svarajya border. Prince Muizuddin was in the Ahmednagar region, while Shahabuddin Firozjung was trying to reduce Maratha forts in Baglana. Sambhaji had posted Hambirrao Mohite, his Commander-in-Chief, to oppose the Mughals, south of the river Bhima. Manaji More and Rupaji Bhosle were active in Baglana, while Keso Trimal and his nephew, Nilakantha Moreshwar, the Peshwa guarded the passes leading into the Konkan".[114] To defend the Svarajya, Sambhaji posted 5000 troops to guard the forts near the mouth of Pen river. By that he was to arrest the southward advance of the Mughals. He also posted 15000 troops to defend the low country from Chaul to Nagothana. To the East of the Ghats, he appointed 20000 cavalry troops, and distributed them between Satara and Phonda to face the southern division of the army of Aurangzeb.[115]

The Mughal Siege of Ramsej - 1682.

Aurangzeb had sent Shahabuddin Firozjung and Rao Dalpat, the Rajput Chief of Datia, to reduce the Maratha forts in Baglana. In April, 1682, Shahabuddin laid siege to the fort of Ramsej, which is 7 miles North of Nasik.[116]

---

114. Ibid., p.24.
115. Sarkar-Aurangzib IV, p.256.
116. Massir-i-Alamgiri - Pagadi, p.22.

The Marathas defended that fort gallantly against the pressure of the Mughal army. The garrison of the fort of Ramsej was aided by the Maratha relief forces operating under the generals of Sambhaji - Manaji More and Rupaji Bhosle. Rupaji and Manaji fought a battle with Shahabuddin near Ganesh Gaon, and captured five hundred horses from the Mughals.[117] The Mughals could not make any impression on the fort of Ramsej. Shahabuddin then constructed a large wooden tower capable of holding about 500 musketeers and continued the siege.[118]

On getting the news of the arrival of the Maratha relief forces in the neighbourhood of Ramsej, Aurangzeb ordered Bahadurkhan to camp at Nasik (Gulshanabad). Shahabuddinkhan was unable to capture the fort of Ramsej in spite of his attacking it several times. Rao Dalpat was injured and several Mughal soldiers were killed in those attempts.[119]

Aurangzeb then transferred Shahabuddinkhan from Ramsej and posted him to Junnar. After that Bahadurkhan continued the siege of Ramsej. In spite of his constant exertions to reduce that fortress , he was unsuccessful in his undertaking. All his attempts were made to fail by the Marathas.[120] As a result, in August, 1682,

---

117. Jedhe Shakavali, p.32.
118. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha-Pagadi, p.81.
119. Ibid, Pp.81-82; Pagadi-Maratha Mughal Relations, p.25.
120. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha-Pagadi, p.82.

Aurangzeb withdrew Bahadurkha, and ordered Kasimkhan, another Mughal commander, to capture the fort of Ramsej. But he also proved to be unsuccessful in that task as the Marathas repelled all his attacks on that fort.[121]

In September, 1682, Bahadurkhan again besieged the fortress of Ramsej on all its sides according to the orders of Aurangzeb and managed to capture one of its bastion.[122] But he was not able to capture that fortress.

Umdtulmulk, another Mughal cammander, besieged the fortress of Ramsej in October, 1682.[123] He also was not successful in his attempt to capture it from Marathas.

In November, 1682, Bahadurkhan who had laid siege to the fort of Ramsej, gave up his attempt to capture that fort. He then went to Tal Konkan, and then to Chandawad.[124] Even though Bahadurkhan had spent a sum of Rs.37630 in order to conquer the fort of Ramsej, he could not conquer it.[125] As the Maratha cammandant of the fort of Ramsej had shown exceptional tenacity and bravery in defending that fort against the continuous attacks of the Mughals, Sambhaji richly rewarded him and transferred him to ~~any~~ an important fort.[126]

---

121. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.294,Pp.169-170.
122. Ibid., No.321, p.185; No.318,p.183; No.326,Pp.188-189.
123. Ibid., No.349, p.203.
124. Ibid., No.361, p.211.
125. Ibid., No.381, p.228.
126. Khafikhan-Pagadi, p.11.

Maratha Activity in Baglana - 1682.

When the Mughals had concentrated their attention on the capture of the fortress of Ramsej the Maratha troops were active in the territory of Baglana.

In September, 1682, the Maratha troops captured 1500 animals from the territory near Sinnar.[127]

Aurangzeb ordered Mamurkhan to chastise the Maratha troops when they had entered in the Baglana in October, 1682.[128] The Marathas burnt a number of villages of the territory of Gulshanabad (Nasik).[129] The Maratha troops had also gone to besiege fort Kheda (Khanda) in Baglana in October, 1682.[130]

In December, 1682, the Maratha troops were moving in the territory of Baglana. Therefore, Aurangzeb ordered the Mughal Thanedar of that area to remain ready to face them.He also ordered Bahadurkhan to establish strong posts in the Kalyan - Bhiwandi area, and the Naunaj Road.[131] The Maratha troops, who had reached the area around Trimbakeshwar were defeated by Muzaffarkhan(the son of Bahadurkhan) in December, 1682.[132] The Maratha army had also gone to the forts, Hanavantagad (in the Kalavan Taluka, 6 miles to the south-west of Kalavan) and to Khala (?) and the Javala (8 miles to the south-west of Kalavana) forts to collect the Chauth from that area. The Mughal commandant of Dhodapgad (in the hills of Nasik, 15 miles

---

127. Ibid., No.299,p.172.
128. Ibid., No.332,p.193.
129. Ibid., No.339, Pp.197-198.
130. Ibid., No.343,p.200.
131. Ibid., No.389,p.236.
132. Ibid., No.380,p.228.

to south-east of Chandwad), Neknamkhan, marched against them. In the battle against them, he killed 15 Maratha soldiers and wounded many of them. The other 15 Maratha soldiers whom he managed to capture, were sent by him to Aurangzeb.[133]

Thus the Maratha activity kept the Mughal commanders constantly busy in 1682.

Maratha-Mughal Activity in other Areas - 1682.

Poona.

In October, 1682, the Maratha army reached near the fort of Chakan (18 miles north of Poona) whose Mughal commandant was Janbajkhan. When Aurangzeb came to know about that, he sent Shiabuddinkhan to deal with those troops.[134] After that the Maratha troops went towards the territory of Junnar. Therefore, Aurangzeb ordered Shiabuddinkhan to go to the military post of Alaband and prevent the entry of the Marathas in the Junnar area. Accordingly, Shiabuddinkhan pursued those Maratha troops and after looting and burning nearly 20 villages, killed many persons and captured some animals.[135]

In November, 1682, Killichkhan entered in the Maratha territory, which was some 40 miles from the river Bhima. He was attacked by Hambirrao, the Maratha

---

133. Ibid., No. 394, pp.240-241.
134. Ibid., No.345, p.201.
135. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.274.

Commander-in-Chief, and another Maratha general, Vithoji, with an army of 20000 soldiers. With the help of Sarfajkhan, Yalbarshkhan, Kamaluddinkhan, and Kishorsingh Hada, Killichkhan defeated Hambirrao Mohite and Vithoji. The Maratha troops then escaped in the hills when they were pursued by the Mughals.[136]

In the last quarter of December, 1682, Shahajada Muizuddin (son of Muazzam and grandson of Aurangzeb) sent Mughalkhan towards the Maratha fortress of Purandar (in the hills of Poona and 6 miles to the south-west of Saswad).[137] After reaching near the fort of Purandar, Mughalkhan burnt 27 villages of the Marathas. He also defeated the son of Thaku Vanjari, and Manakaji, a servant of Sambhaji.[138]

The Mughal commander, Shihabuddinkhan defeated the Maratha troops when they were near Lohgad (in the hills of Poona and 4 miles to the south of Karle) in December, 1682. Then he went to Visapur (Isapur) and defeated the Maratha army who had gone in that area to collect the Chauth. After that when he got the news that the Maratha troops had entered in the Paragana of Kusur, he went to that territory and defeated them.[139]

In December, 1682, the Marathas invaded the Mughal territory of Shikar (Shikra)Pur which was to the south-west of Poona. But the Mughal Tanadar, Manakoji, defeated Naro Trimal,

---

136. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.354,p.206.
137. Ibid., No.396,p.242.
138. Ibid., No.397, p.243.
139. Ibid., No.388, p.234.

the general of Sambhaji, who was leading those Marathas. In that fighting many Maratha troops were killed and some were wounded.[140]

Tal- Konkan.

The TalKonkan territory was of importance for the movements of Sambhaji's troops against the Mughals. Therefore, he took steps to prevent the entry of the Mughals in that area.[141] The Mughals tried to penetrate in that area in 1682.

In November, 1682, the Mughal general, Shihabuddinkhan left his bag and baggage at Junnar and attacked the TalKonkan territory. He looted 20 Maratha villages, and killing 400 persons, arrested 1000 men and captured 4000 animals.[142]

Kalyan-Bhiwandi.

It was necessary for the Mughals to bring under their control the Maratha forts in the Thana district in order to cause thrusts in the territory of the Svarajya. It was convenient for the Mughals to undertake military moves to that effect from their military post at Junnar. Therefore, Aurangzeb, sent his generals to conquer the forts of the Kalyan-Bhivandi area at the time when his other generals had besieged the forts in the Baglana area.

---

140. Ibid., No.379, p.227.
141. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.251.
142. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.365,p.216;
No.367,p.217.

In April, 1682, giving a command of 1900 troops to Hassanalikhan, Aurangzeb had sent him to the Kalyan-Bhivandi area of the Svarajya. The Mughal activity of warfare in that area assumed great tempo in November, 1682, when the Mughal general, Ranamastakhan occupied Kalyan.[143] Chhatrapati Sambhaji then sent Rupaji Bhosle, Kesopant, and Nilopant Peshva against him.[144] The town of Mehendali which was 5 miles from Kalyan-Bhivandi, was attacked and looted by 2000 Maratha troops. The Mughal general, Mukavrankhan fought a severe engagement against them near Uran, a village to a distance of 30 miles from Mehendali. In that engagement many soldiers from both the sides were killed, and some were wounded. After that engagement, Mukarramkam camped at Mehendali.[145]

In December, 1682, Aurangzeb sent Bahadurkhan in the Kalyan-Bhivandi area. To check his advance, Chhatrapati Sambhaji sent 7000 Maratha troops. Bahadurkhan defeated those troops. He then repaired the defence wall which was around Kalyan. Bahadurkhan also defeated 10000 cavalry and 12000 infantry soldiers of the Marathas when they had attacked him. After that Bahadurkhan marched towards the Maratha fortress of Bitingal (?) and set fire to a village near it.[146]

---

143. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.254.
144. Jedhe Shakavali, p.32.
145. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.254.
146. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.390, p.237; Gokhale-Sambhaji, Pp.254-255.

In order to pursue his aim of causing destruction in Mughal territory, Sambhaji sent his troops to raid the Maratha-Mughal border land territory in the Ahmednagar district. In their raiding activity, the Maratha troops attacked the following areas in 1682.

Sangamner. It was an important town of the Sangamner Taluka. In May, 1682, about 200 Maratha cavalry troops entered in the Sangamner district and reached to the territory of 8 miles near Sangamner. On hearing about it, Naroji, the Mughal Thanedar of Sangamner, sent Indrasingh Kacchavaha and Saiyyad Muzaffarkhan against those troops. On their approach, the Maratha troops pretended to flee from that territory and thereby tempted the Mughal troops to pursue them. When the Mughal troops pursued them, 4000 Maratha troops, who had remained hidden near a rivulet, attacked those Mughal troops. In the battle which took place between the Marathas and the Mughals, Indrasingh Kacchavaha got wounded and the Marathas became voctorious. On getting that news, Naroji and Suleiman Beg rushed to that place in order to help the Mughal troops. As a result, the Mughals fought again with the Marathas. In that battle one prominent Maratha noble and 600 Maratha cavalry troops were killed by the Mughals. On the Mughal side Suleiman Beg was severely wounded.[147]

---

147. Gokhale-Ibid., Pp.281-282.

After that, in August, 1682, 200 Maratha cavalry and 500 infantry troops attacked Kasba Sinnar, and captured 1500 animals. After getting a news about it, Naroji, the Mughal Thanedar of Sangamner, rushed to that area. But since he did not possess adequate number of troops to face the Marathas, he returned to Sangameshwar without fighting against these Maratha troops.[148]

The Marathas were constantly moving around the territory of Sangamner. In September, 1682, the Marathas, who had come from the Tal Konkan, had passed by the village Davari(?). Sometime before 28th November, 1682, about 600-700 Maratha troops had reached near Sangamner in order to collect the Chauth. Therefore, Naroji, the Mughal Thanedar of Sangamner, sent Muzaffarkhan and Rao Mahekamsingh with an army and asked them to block the roads which were to the side of Audh-Patta. After that Naroji also reached that area and encircled the Maratha troops. In the engagement which took place between him and the Maratha troops, as the Maratha commander, Laxman or Lakhuji was killed, the Marathas fled from that area.[149]

Ahmednagar

At Ahmednagar existed the main base of the Mughals to direct the war activity against the Marathas in the Ahmednagar district.

---

148. Ibid., p.282.
149. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.376, p.224.

Since the Maratha troops were attacking Ahmednagar in order to effect the rescue of the women of Sambhaji, who had remained behind in the Mughal camp at the time of his escape to the Svarajya, from that camp and who had been kept by Aurangzeb in the fort of Ahmednagar, Aurangzeb shifted them from that fort to the fortress of Daulatabad.[150]

In May, 1682, when the Marathas again renewed their attacks in the territory of Ahmednagar, Aurangzeb deputed Ruhullakhan to Ahmednagar. Hassanalikhan also sent Dilavarkhan and Shaikhji to that territory. The Mughal army fought an engagement with the Maratha troops and recovered from them the goods they had looted and the animals they had captured.[151]

For the defence of the city and fortress of Ahmednagar, Aurangzeb sent Shahajada Muizuddin to Ahmednagar in September, 1682, against the Marathas. Aurangzeb also sent Shahabuddinkhan for his help at Ahmednagar.

In October, 1682, 5000 Maratha troops reached near Ahmednagar. Throughout the year 1682, the Maratha troops were hovering aroundthe city of Ahmednagar.[152]

Pedgaon (Bahadurgad)

Pedgaon, where the fort Bahadurgad exists, is to the south of the city of Shrigonde in the Shrigonde Taluka.

---

150. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.284.
151. Ibid.
152. Ibid.

The Marathas used to go to Ahmednagar through its territory. Therefore, Aurangzeb ordered Shahajada Muizuddin, to whom he had sent earlier to Ahmednagar, to leave Ahmednagar and to go to Pedgaon in order to prohibit the entry of the Marathas in the Ahmednagar area through Pedgaon.

He was required to rush to face the Marathas as soon as he reached the area of Pedgaon. Seeing that he was coming to fight with them, the Maratha troops fled from that territory.

In December, 1682, Raja Durgasingh valad Raja Devisingh defeated 3000 Maratha soldiers at Sargane Kavathe. Those troops were led by the Maratha generals, Manako Ballal Pandit and Lakhamaji. In that battle, Manako Ballal was killed and Lakhamaji fled away from the field. In it, Durgasingh and others from the Mughal side were wounded.[153]

Sholapur District

As Sambhaji had decided to attack the Mughal territories and carry out destruction in them, he directed his troops to the area of Tembhurni of the Sholapur District in 1682.

Tembhurni

The town of Tembhurni is 16 miles to the north of Pandharpur in the Sholapur district.

---

153. Ibid., Pp.286-287; Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.377, p.296.

Shahajada Azzamshah had his camp at Tembhurni in October, 1682. He sent Kilichkhan and Sarafarzkhan with 13000 troops. They crossed the river Bhima. At that time the Maratha troops had come to a distance of 12 Kos from Tembhurni.[154] In November-December, 1682, the Maratha troops constantly attacked the territory of Tembhurni. Therefore, Bahadurkhan went to Tembhurni from the Tal Konkan. He got constructed a small fort near the fort of Tembhurni. Bahadurkhan then collected the Zamindars of the Sholapur district together.

Due to the constant attacks of the Marathas on the territory of Tembhurni, the camp of Bahadurkhan experienced scarcity of goods, and the prices of goods shot up in his camp. For a rupee one could get 9-10 seers of grains or one seer of sweet oil.[155]

In November, 1682, 2000 Maratha troops, who had entered the territory of Tembhurni, were seen at a distance of 8 miles from Khabaspura (8 miles to the west of Sangola in Sangola district). Muhammad Azzamshah then despatched the Mughal generals, Kilichkhan and Hassanalikhan, to fight against them. They fought a severe battle against the Marathas. As a result the Maratha troops were defeated and pursued by them for a distance of 4 Kos.[156]

---

154. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.329, p.190.
155. Ibid., No.382, p.229.
156. Ibid., No.368, Pp.218-219.

Osmanabad District

The territory of the Osmanabad district of the Mughals was attacked by the troops of Sambhaji since the month of December, 1681. It was probably to counter check their raiding activity that Shahajada Muhammad Azzamshah left his bag and baggage and servants in the fort of Parinda, and crossing the river Bhima, he planned to take with him the army of Kilichkhan in order to attack the Maratha territory on 5th November, 1682.[157]

Aurangabad District

Chhatrapati Sambhaji sent his troops constantly during 1682 to raid and loot the Mughal territory in the Aurangabad district. The following areas of that district suffered as a result of the war activity of the Marathas in 1682.

Jalna

The city of Jalna is 20 miles to the east of the city of Aurangabad.

In April, 1682, 10000Maratha troops entered the territory of Jalna in order to collect the Chauth from the people. As a result some Mughal subjects of that area went to reside with a Muslim Fakir Shaikh Jan Muhammad, in order to secure protection against the Marathas and to save themselves from the payment of Chauth.

---

157. Ibid., No.356, p.208.

But the Maratha commander, Sambhaji(Aka ?), told the troops under him to collect the Chauth from those people without showing undue respect to that Fakir in that matter. As a result, the Maratha troops asked the Fakir to hand over to them the persons who were under his protection. When the Fakir did not respond to what they said,the Maratha troops looted the city of Jalna.[158]

Antur

The town of Antur is 40 miles from Aurangabad and 6 miles to the north-east of Kannad.

The territory of Antur was attacked by the troops of Sambhaji in August, 1682. Initially, when the Mughal Thanedar of Antur, Ahmad, tried to fight against them, they fled from that area. But after sometime a Maratha army of about 10000 to 12000 soldiers entered that area. As a result of that the Thanedar of Antur wrote to Aurangzeb to send immediate help to him to face the raiding Marathas. Aurangzeb, then sent Shahabuddinkhan and other commanders for the help of the Thanedar of Antur.[159] But as soon as Shahabuddinkhan reached Antur, he was ordered by Aurangzeb to proceed to Ahmednagar to fight against the Marathas who had attacked that territory at that time. Therefore, when the Maratha troops again

---

158. Gokhale-Sambhaji,Pp.245-246.
159. Ibid., Pp.245-246; Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.325, p.188.

attacked the territory of Antur on 3rd October, 1682, those were defeated by the Mughal general, Abdul Khairkhan and Ahmad, the Thanedar of Antur.[160]

Vaijapur

Out of the Maratha soldiers, who were attacking the territory of Antur, 500 went towards Vaijapur in the end of October, 1682, in order to conduct loot in that area. Bahadurkhan, then sent his son, Muzafferkhan to fight against them. But by the time he reached the territory of Vaijapur, some of the Maratha troops took a route towards Aurangabad. As a result, Muhiyuddinkuli Gurjabdar went to deal with them and defeated them.[161]

Gandapur

In November, 1682, 1500 Maratha troops entered the territory of Gandapur to collect Chauth. Therefore the Mughal Thanedar of Lasur, Tirandag, went for the help of Muzaffarkhan, the Fauzdar of Gandapur. They both fought against the Maratha troops and defeated them.[162]

Bidar

Bidar was formerly in the State of Hyderabad. At present it is in the Mysore State and is near the present territory of the Usmanabad district of Maharashtra.

In the middle of December, 1682, the Maratha troops of Sambhaji penetrated in the territory of Bidar in order to

---

160. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.246; Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.330, p.191.
161. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.352, p.205.
162. Ibid., No.373, Pp.221-222; No374,p.222.

collect Chauth. They looted some villages in that territory and while proceeding towards Berar, they carried away with them the persons whom they had arrested, and the animals they had captured.

As the Mughal general, Mukarramkhan did not march against them after getting the news of their activity, emperor Aurangzeb reduced his Mansab.[163]

Berar

The prosperous Mughal territory of Berar was constantly attacked and looted by the troops of Sambhaji during 1682 A.D.

After attacking and looting the town of Malkapur in Berar in December, 1681, when the Marathas were collecting Chauth in the territory of Berar, the Mughal generals, Baharozkhan and Atishkhan fought an engagement against them. In that engagement, 1000 Maratha troops were slained by the Mughals. The Mughals also captured much material from the Marathas in January, 1682.[164]

One division of the Maratha troops in Berar attacked the city of Chanda of the Chanda district late in January, 1682,and looted that city. Ramsingh, the Zamindar of Chanda, who was not present in that city at the time when the Marathas attacked and looted it, fought against them after when he returned to that city. In that engagement 150 troops of Ramsingh and 500 soldiers of the Marathas were killed.[165]

---

163. Ibid., No.385, p.231.
164. Gokhale-Sambhaji,Pp.239-240.
165. Ibid., p.240.

In February, 1682, after looting and collecting Chauth from the different parts of Berar, the Maratha troops looted the prosperous Mughal district of Akola. Then they swooped upon Balaghat (near Mehekar) and Devalgaon, and collected Chauth from those areas. After learning about that destructive activity of the Marathas, emperor Aurangzeb ordered Irazkhan to take necessary steps to stop that activity of the Marathas, and write to him about the steps he had taken to that effect.[166]

Nagoji Ballal, the general of Sambhaji, attacked Mehakar in the Buldhana district with a force of 12000 troops and looted that territory. When with the goods he had looted and the animals he captured, he reached the Kholpur Paragana (in Taluka Darvha in the Yawatmal district), the Mughal general, Mukarramkhan, rushed there after crossing a distance of 25 Kos, and attacked Nagoji Ballal and his troops near the fort of Vashim. Meanwhile, the other Mughal general, Irazkhan, rushed there for the help of Mukarramkhan. In the engagements which were fought between the Mughals and the Marathas, many soldiers from both the sides were wounded and killed. Finally, the Marathas fled from the territory of Balapur.[167]

The Mughal Thrust in South Svarajya - 1682.

Aurangzeb ordered Muhammad Azzamshah to attack the Svarajya from the Southern direction and bring in danger

---

166. Ibid.
167. Ibid.

the Maratha territory of Panhala - Kolhapur.

Accordingly, Azzamshah reached to the distance of 6 Kos from the Maratha fort of Panhala. There he was attacked by Hambirrao, the Commander-in-Chief of Chhatrapati Sambhaji, with the help of 15000 cavalry and 500 infantry. In the fierce battle which raged between them, the Mughal generals, Firozkhan, Kilichkhan, Hassanalikhan, Rao Anupsingh, Amiruddhasingh Hada, Sarfrazkhan, and personally Shahajada Muhammad Azzamshah fought gallantly. The Mughals killed 800 and captured 700 Maratha soldiers. The Marathas killed many Mughal soldiers, and wounded the Mughal general, Firozkhan and his son in that battle. Another Mughal general who was wounded by a bullet by the Marathas was Kilichkhan. The result of that battle was inconclusive for both the sides.[168]

Sambhaji and Akbar - 1682

Chhatrapati Sambhaji was in the thick of hostilities with Siddis when Akbar sought asylum. On granting Akbar asylum, Sambhaji had to fight on two fronts - one with the Siddis and the other with Aurangzeb.

In that eventuality, Sambhaji seems to have decided to exert hard first to put an end to the power of the Siddis of Janjira and make that front safe for him before he started vigorous warfare against Aurangzeb.

---

168. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.392, Pp.239-240; No.397, p.243.
Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.294.

To realize that objective, Chhatrapati Sambhaji renewed his activities with more vigour against the Siddis in December, 1681. He took Akbar with him and besieged the fort of Janjira with a strong force of twenty thousand Maratha troops.[169] Under the personal direction of Sambhaji the Maratha troops bombarded the walls of the fort of Janjira and exerted heavy pressure on the Siddis.[170] But at the time when the victory was almost certain, Sambhaji was required to delegate the operations of that siege to the care of his officers on 4th February, 1682, and go personally to face the Mughal forces of Aurangzeb who had advanced in the Svarajya under Hassanalikhan in the territory of Kalyan.[171] As has been pointed out in section,'War with the Siddis', the Siddis of Janjira, who escaped annihilation at the hands of Sambhaji at this time, proved to be a constant source of trouble to the Svarajya throughout the reign of Sambhaji.

Meanwhile emperor Aurangzeb tried to persuade Akbar by his affectionate letters to return to him.[172] In those letters Aurangzeb told Akbar that if he came back to him he would pardon all his offences which he had committed by rebelling against him. But in his reply to those letters Akbar communicated to Aurangzeb[173] that he had several doubts

---

169. Grant Duff-HMI, p.251; Sardesai-Sambhaji,p.38.
170. Sambhaji Shakavali, p.110.
171. Ibid.
172. Khutute Shivaji, Pp.57-58.
173. Ibid., Pp.58-62;Manucci-Storia Do Mogor,-II,p.242.

in his mind, and therefore, requested Aurangzeb to arrange their meeting at some appointed place in the presence of some selected persons.

It is not known from the extant sources whether Aurangzeb had taken this suggestion of Akbar seriously. No such meeting was held.

Seeing that persuation was not effective, Aurangzeb seems to have decided to be stern in his dealings with Akbar. Aurangzeb through his letters,asked the Portuguese "not to give any assistance or passage to Akbar (to go out of India or to any of its other parts) and told them to capture or kill him if they get an opportunity."[174] Aurangzeb also wrote similar letters to other kings and the Jahagirdars who were around the Svarajya, and the English, and the Siddis of Janjira.[175]

It appears that when Sambhaji withdrew from the siege of the fort of Janjira in February, 1682, he and Akbar had planned that Akbar should go to north India with an army, and with the help of his Rajput supporters should establish his court at Delhi after defeating Aurangzeb. Some inkling of this plan is seen in the letter which Akbar wrote to Raja Ramsingh of Amber (Rajput State of Jaipur) on 22nd May, 1682. In that letter Akbar wrote to Raja Ramsingh "remain ready

---

174. Manucci-Storia Do Mogor II, p.244.
175. Bendre-Sambhaji, Pp.197-198.

with your ears alert for the news (of my coming). When I march with my victorious army towards Hindustan, you should join my victorious followers and exert yourself greatly in my imperial service, which will be the cause of your being favoured at Court and honoured".[176] But it seems that like the Rana of Mewad, Raja Ramsingh of Jaipur was also no longer interested in supporting the cause of Akbar against emperor Aurangzeb at that time. That Raja Ramsingh of Amber(Jaipur) was earlier having communication with Sambhaji and in his letters earlier he had expressed that Sambhaji had "acted rightly in offering shelter in the Svarajya to Sultan Akbar" and had signified his "readiness to execute whatever was considered expedient in the circumstances," is revealed from the letter which Chhatrapati Sambhaji had written to him in November, 1682.[177] In spite of that Raja Ramsingh of Amber (Jaipur) wrote to Sambhaji (probably in November, 1682) that "no opposition should be offered (by Sambhaji) to the Emperor of Delhi (Aurangzeb), but his suzerainty should be accepted[178](by Sambhaji)". By making this suggestion Raja Ramsingh let down Akbar (who had taken a stand against Aurangzeb due to the Rajput support promised to him in that matter), as well as Chhatrapati Sambhaji, who had given an asylum to Akbar.

---

176. Sarkar-House of Shivaji,Pp.204-205.
177. Ibid., p.206.
178. Ibid., p.205.

It was easy for Raja Ramsingh of Amber (Jaipur), since he was already under the Mughal suzerainty, to advice Chhatrapati Sambhaji to accept the suzerainty of Aurangzeb. But it was difficult for Chhatrapati Sambhaji, who was a Paramount Sovereign of the Svarajya, to even think about the idea of accepting the suzerainty of Aurangzeb. But the circumstance developed before him after giving an asylum to Akbar was such that he had no alternative left than to continue his war against Aurangzeb to the final point. For, even if he was to withdraw the asylum given to Akbar now, Aurangzeb, who had come personally to the Deccan with all his formidable resources, would not have allowed Chhatrapati Sambhaji to reign as an independent ruler of the Svarajya.

Being fully aware of this, Sambhaji seems to have decided to continue his war against Aurangzeb for an indefinite period. This resolve of his he communicated to Raja Ramsingh of Amber (Jaipur) in his above mentioned letter and feeling probably that at least for serving the cause of defending Hinduism against Aurangzeb's intolerant aggression, he might still decide to help him (Sambhaji), he solicited the support of Raja Ramsingh. He also told Raja Ramsingh that Akbar has been able to secure the support of Shah Abbas of Persia against Aurangzeb. As Sambhaji was of the wish that Akbar should acquire the throne of Delhi with the support of the Rajputs and the Marathas, he wrote to Raja Ramsingh that "it does not in our opinion behove us to accept Muslim help in this cause and enable Abbas to gain the credit. If you and we join our forces and place Akbar on the throne, we shall get the opportunity of

protecting our religion."[179]

It seems that in August, 1682, in their meeting Sambhaji and Akbar had decided that Akbar should go to Ahmedabad by sea and from there to Marwad (in order to muster the support for his cause against Aurangzeb).[180] Aurangzeb learnt about their plan and to defeat it he asked his officer Ruhullakhan to communicate to the Subhedar of Ahmedabad and Baroda to arrest Akbar (if he happened to come to that territory). Similarly Aurangzeb also sent orders to the Fauzdars of Ahmedabad, Surat, Baroda, Thalner, Nandurbar, Rover, Malwa, and other places, to arrest Akbar (if he happened to come to their territory).[181]

After that Akbar stayed at Tikona. But the climate of Tikona did not suit his health. Therefore, he shifted to Jaitapur. The climate of Jaitapur also did not suit his health. His relatives also fell sick at Jaitpur.[182]

As a result of his sickness and the arrangement which after learning about his plan from the spies Aurangzeb had made to effect his arrest if he went to Ahmedabad by sea and from there to Marwad, it seems that Akbar could not go to Marwad, as was planned by him and Sambhaji in their meeting of August, 1682.

It appears that when they realized that the going of Akbar to Ahmedabad by sea was dangerous for him because of

---

179. Ibid., p.207.
180. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.106.
181. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI,No.301,p.174; Gokhale-Ibid.
182. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.309,p.178.

the arrangement made by Aurangzeb to arrest him if he went to that side, Chhatrapati Sambhaji and Akbar seem to have decided sometime in November, 1682, that Akbar and Durgadas should go to Gujarat (with an army against the Mughals). As a result of that it seems that Sambhaji wrote to Raja Ramsingh of Amber (Jaipur) in November, 1682, that "we are planning to despatch Akbar and Durgadas in Gujarat, so that you on your side must courageously execute whatever is possible".[183] What was the response of Raja Ramsingh to that proposal of Sambhaji cannot be understood by us as the documents which would give information about their further communication with each other are not available. But it seems probable that the response of Raja Ramsingh to that proposal must have been cold. For we do not find that as was planned by Sambhaji, after his above communication to Raja Ramsingh, he enthusiastically pursued the idea of sending Akbar and Durgadas with an army to Gujarat, which being advantageous to him, he would have readily done had he been shown support by Raja Ramsingh in that matter.

When Sambhaji was persuading Raja Ramsingh to help Akbar to go to the North, an incident seems to have taken place by the end of 1682 due to which Sambhaji got displeased with Akbar, who seems to have been staying at Jaitapur at that time.[184]

---

183. Sarkar-House of Shivaji, p.207.
184. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.106 and F.N. 4; States this on the basis of the Akhabar of 13th September, 1682; p.107.

It seems that Sambhaji had presented to Akbar a necklace of pearls and an elephant. Akbar had made a Hindu dancing girl (ram-zani) Muslim and kept her in his harem, and gave her the pearl necklace and other things presented to him as gifts by Chhatrapati Sambhaji. When the news of it reached Sambhaji, he sent a messenger and asked Akbar as to why did he give the necklace and other things to the dancing girl when they were presented by him for his royal paraphernalia. On that Akbar told Sambhaji that "I am an Emperor's son, I shall do whatever comes to my mind." After hearing that insolent reply, Sambhaji sent a message asking Akbar to send away the troops which he had given under Akbar. Therefore, Akbar, finding himself helpless, set fire to his house, assumed the guise of a faqir and started for Goa from Jaitapur.[185]

When Aurangzeb learnt that Akbar was trying to go out of the Svarajya, he alerted all his officers and asked them to pursue (and capture) him if he tried to escape through the territories under them to the North or to Marwad.[186]

Mughal Efforts in Baglana - upto August, 1683.

The Mughal armies were making every effort to reduce the Maratha forts in Baglana and bring that territory under their control. But their efforts were not successful upto

---

185. Sarkar-House of Shivaji, Pp.208-209; Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.431, p.268.
186. Gokhale-Sambhaji, Pp.107-108.

August, 1683.

In January, 1683, the Mughal commander, Sayyad Izzatkhan was exerting to reduce the fortress of Kanhergad of the Baglana. The Maratha troops attacked him near that fort. But Sayyad Izzatkhan defeated them.[187]

The Mughals were also trying to conquer the Maratha fort of Salher (8 miles to the north-west of Satana in Nasik district) in Baglana. In their strategy to capture the Maratha fortresses, along with the measures of warfare, the Mughals also employed the measures of bribery and seduction. In either of those measures the Mughals were not successful in relation to the fort of Salher.[188] But the Mughal Thanedar of Parasa, Mahammad Badi Balkhi, succeeded in seducing a Zamindar of Dahakama(na) and capture the fort of Dahakama(na). He then established the Mughal military post at that place.[189]

Maratha Efforts in the Kalyan-Bhivandi Sector-upto August 1683.

In January, 1683, the Mughal generals, Ranamastakhan and Bahadurkhan were at the Mughal military base of operations at Kalyan-Bhivandi. They were continuously attacked by the Maratha troops. Therefore, Ruhullakhan sent Yashwantrao, a Mughal officer for their help.[190]

As the Mughal army in the Kalyan-Bhivandi sector was

---

187. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.400, p.245.
188. Gokhale-Sambhaji, Pp.216-217.
189. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.461,p.291.
190. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.256.

in the need of grains and other supplies, Siddi Yakutkhan, the commander of the Mughal navy, supplied those to the Mughal army. This was done by Yakutkhan as the Portuguese of Goa had given the Mughals a facility to ply their ships between Thana and Kalyan.

The grant of that facility to the Mughals revealed the inimical posture of the Portuguese towards the Marathas. That resulted in spoiling the relations between Sambhaji and the Portuguese.

To set to naught that facility, the Marathas tried to construct a fort at Parasik near Kalyan in order to obstruct the Mughal ships plying towards Kalyan. But the Portuguese defeated that effort of the Marathas. The Portuguese then constructed their own fort at Parasik.[191]

In the first quarter of January, 1683, the Marathas attacked Bahadurkhan thrice at Kalyan. But he managed to defeat those Marathas and as was ordered by Aurangzeb he kept 2000 cavalry troops under him at Kalyan.[192]

After that, Tukoji, the Maratha commander of Sambhaji reached with his army to a distance of 4 miles from Kalyan in order to attack that city. Therefore, Bahadurkhan took with him Siddi Yakutkhan and Samikhan, and taking under him the forces of Daudkhan, Abulfayyazkhan and Shujawalkhan, attacked Tukoji from three sides. In a fierce battle which

---

191. Pissurlenkar-Portugej-Marathe Sambandha,p.91.
192. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.398,p.244.

took place between them, Tukoji was killed, and the Maratha troops which fled from the battle field were pursued by the Mughals upto a distance of 5 Kos.[193]

In order to prevent the ships carrying provisions from Surat to Bahadurkhan at Kalyan, the Marathas captured two forts of the Portuguese in the territory of Thana and Bassein. Bahadurkhan then sent Siddi Yakutkhan against the Marathas. After that Bahadurkhan himself marched against the Marathas. He captured one of those forts after a stiff battle from the Marathas and demolished it.[194]

In February, 1683, a Maratha general had blocked the passages of the Mughal army. Therefore, Ruhullakhan sent Padamsingh and other Mughal general against him. In an engagement the Mughals defeated the Marathas and killed 400 Maratha soldiers. Then the Marathas were pursued by Bahadurkhan. The Portuguese helped the Mughals in that engagement.[195]

The Maratha troops had entered the territory of Kalyan-Bhivandi in the last quarter of March, 1683. Ruhullakhan, the Mughal commander, who had joined Bahadurkhan at Kalyan on 15th March, 1683, attacked those troops. Many soldiers from both the sides were killed in that engagement.[196]

After that, Hambirrao Mohite, the Commander-in-Chief

---

193. Ibid., No.405,p.249.
194. Ibid., No.429, Pp.266-267.
195. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.257.
196. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.461, p.292; Gokhale-Sambhaji,p.258.

of Sambhaji, marched against the Mughals with 20000 cavalry and 10000 infantry in the Kalyan-Bhivandi area. He was attacked by Bahadurkhan. In the battle which was fiercely fought between them, Hambirrao was wounded by an arrow. In it the brother-in-law of Hambirrao, and other three Maratha commanders were killed. The Maratha army which fled from the battle-field was pursued by the Mughals. On the Mughal side the Mughal commanders, Padmasingh, Bhagvatsingh Valad Manoko Tukoji, Madhorao Sisodia, Mansingh, Dilerkhan, Akramkhan, Kasimkhan, Navazishkhan, Ajmatullahkhan, Sayyad Abdul Hadi, Sayyad Murtaza, Muhammad Yar, Ibrahim Beg, Muatsim Beg, Sayyad Bahadur, Kwaja Muhammad Salih, Sayyad Yusuf, Shaikh Farid Valad Hamidkhan, Mir Muhammad, Valad Multafitkhan, Bhagwantsing Valad Ramsing, Shyamsing, Raja Durgsing, Sayyad Abdusshakur, Sayyad Nasib, Sayyad Mujahid, Sayyad Jalal, Sayyad Ghayat, Nasir Beg, Humayun Ali and Fardha Beg were killed by the Marathas in that fierce battle. Additionally, the following Mughal Mansabdars were wounded in that battle - Vasantrao, Nivasrao, Dwarakoji, Chhatrasal valad Ratan Rathod, Basantrao, Sundardas, Uditsing, Kabulising, Bhanarao, Bhimsing, Bhojraj, Kalyanrao, Dilerkhan, Akramkhan, Navizishkhan, Raja Durgsing, Kwaja Muhammad Adil, Abdusshakur, Sayyad Nuruddin, Abdul Kadir, Haji Burhan, Haji Abdullah Beg, Aivaj Beg, Badiuzzaman, Mir Khalan and Some of the relatives of Kasimkhan and Kwaja Yakub.[197]

---

197. Ibid., No.462, p.293; Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.257.

In April, 1683, Chhatrapati Sambhaji sent Rupaji Bhosle and Manaji More against the Mughals in the area of Kalyan Bhivandi. When they reached to a distance of 14 miles from Kalyan-Bhivandi, they were attacked by Saifullakhan(son of Ruhullakhan), to whom Aurangzeb had sent in that area in April, 1683. The Marathas then left their baggage and escaped in a nearby forest. The Marathas set fire to 2/3 nearby villages.[198]

After that event, the Mughal general Rohilakhan descended from Kalwan (in the Paud Valley near Kalyan) in the Kalyan-Bhivandi area. Another Mughal commander, Ranamastkhan, came to the ghat and went away (to Kalyan). When he was coming to the ghat, Rupaji Bhosle attacked him near Titvala(4¼ miles to the north-east of Kalyan). In a fierce battle which took place between them, the Marathas slained Padmasing, a Rajput commander of Aurangzeb, and many other Mughal commanders of great note.[199]

Due to the effective resistance of the Marathas the Mughals could not make any effective advance in the territory of Kalyan-Bhivandi upto August, 1683.

Maratha Attacks on the Mughal Territories - Upto August,1683.

While resisting the Mughal advance in the territory of the Svarajya, Chhatrapati Sambhaji sent his troops to loot the Mughal territories and to cause destruction in

---

198. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.468,p.300.
199. Jedhe Shakavali, p.32.

those areas. The following Mughal territories were under the attacks of the Maratha troops upto August, 1683.

Aurangabad District

In the last quarter of February, 1683, 7000 Maratha troops entered in the Mughal territory of Aurangabad. They pushed their way upto a distance of 14 miles from the city of Jalna. The Maratha troops then collected Chauth from the residents of that area.

When Aurangzeb got the news about that activity of the Marathas, he sent Lutfullakhan to fight against them in that area.[200]

After that the Maratha troops captured the elephants of Shah Alam, and the camels of other Mughal subjects in the area which was 24 miles from Jalna.[201] The Mughal general Lutfullakhan then defeated those Marathas and recovered from them those elephants and camels.[202]

The Maratha troops also entered in the territory of Nanded. Aurangzeb then sent Shahajada Muizzuddin to fight against them. Aurangzeb ordered Bahadurkhan to proceed to that area and help Shahajada Muizzuddin in his task. He joined Shahajada Muizzuddin at Ramai (16 Kos from Aurangabad and on the banks of river Godavari). After that they both proceeded to Bedar.

---

200. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.436, p.272.
201. Ibid., No.438, p.273.
202. Ibid., No.452, p.283.

By the time they reached Bedar, they learnt that the imperial elephants out grazing near Pathri (57 miles west of Nanded) were being carried off by the Marathas. Therefore, Bahadurkhan hastened back from Bedar and by forced marches overtook the Maratha troops and rescued the elephants after a long running fight, which carried him to the frontiers of Chanda and Golkonda. Then he encamped at Kamtan (6 miles south-west of Bedar). It was a highly creditable feat as during that campaign the Mughal troops had to bear great hardships; even Bahadurkhan had no tent; and the Mughal army had to live on coarsest food.[203]

Osmanabad District

In January, 1683, the Maratha troops entered in the Osmanabad district. Therefore the Mughal generals, Kasimkhan and Ilhamullahkhan went to fight against them near Naldurg (30 miles south-east to Osmanabad).[204]

In February, 1683, Manako Ballal, the commander of Chhatrapati Sambhaji, reached near Naldurg with an army of 5000 troops. The Mughal general Kasimkhan attacked him. In that engagement, though the Mughal commanders like Gurjabdars and Abid Diwan Saina were killed by the Marathas, finally, Kasimkhan defeated Manako Ballal.[205]

In spite of that defeat, the Maratha troops continued to attack and loot the territory around Naldurg and Kalyani in February, 1683. That led Aurangzeb to order Bahadurkhan

---

203. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha-Pagadi, Pp.82-83.
204. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.415, Pp.256-257.
205. Ibid., No.425, Pp.263-264.

to go to that territory and fight against the Marathas.[206]

Bhir District

In March, 1683, Naroji, the commander of Sambhaji had penetrated with his army in the territory of Fatahabad(Dharur). The Mughal commandant of the fort of Dharur (4 miles to the north of Kej), Kiladarkhan, attacked and defeated him.[207]

Maratha Attacks on Berar - upto August, 1683

In January, 1683, the Maratha troops entered in Berar and looted the territory of Kholapur (in Daravha Taluka of Yavatmal district). They also captured animals of the residents of that territory. Therefore, Irajkhan, the Mughal Subhedar of Berar, and the Mughal commander, Kasimkhan, attacked them. In that engagement, Kasimkhan defeated those Maratha troops and brought back from them the animals they had captured. The Marathas then fled from that territory.[208]

In March, 1683, the Maratha troops went to attack and loot the territory of Berar. Therefore, Bahadurkhan went to fight against them.[209]

Those Maratha troops went towards Akola. On getting that news, Najim Sayyad Munawwarkhan of Burhanpur proceeded to fight against them.[210]

The Maratha troops had gone to the Balapur district of Berar in order to collect Chauth. As a result, the Mughal

---

206. Ibid., No.437,p.237.
207. Ibid., No.457, p.288.
208. Ibid., No.408,p.251.
209. Ibid., No.440, p.274.
210. Ibid., No.443, p.275.

Fauzdar, Muhammad Husen went in that area. After defeating the Marathas, he recovered some of the articles of the loot conducted by the Marathas.[211]

The Maratha army had also penetrated in the Jamod area of Berar in order to collect Chauth. As was wished by Shaikh Jahan, the Mughal Fauzdar of Jamoda, Sayyad Munawwarkhan went for his help against the raiding Maratha troops. After attacking the Maratha troops, Sayyad Munawwarkhan defeated them and recovered the goods and horses which the Marathas had looted earlier. In that engagement, many Marathas were killed by the Mughal army.[212]

Nekrai and other four commanders of Chhatrapati Sambhaji had attacked with a large army under them the territory of Akola taluka in Berar in the second half of March, 1683. When they were carrying with them the men and the animals captured in the territory of Makan (Palas) gaon, the Mughal general, Saifullah, came down from Vashim and attacked them. In that engagement, Saifullah defeated the Maratha troops and recovered from them the men and the animals which they had captured earlier.[213]

After that the Maratha troops went in the territory of Talgaon. Therefore, Irazkhan, the Mughal Subhedar of Berar, went to fight against them and defeated those Maratha troops.

---

211. Ibid., No.444, p.276.
212. Ibid., No.449, p.280.
213. Ibid., No.450, p.281.

The Maratha troops then fled towards Elichpur. As a result, Irazkhan went in that direction in order to pursue them.[214]

Thus the Maratha troops acted in a swift manner and by disturbing the Mughal territory of Berar they managed to keep the Mughal troops on heels.

Ahmednagar District

The Maratha troops attacked the territory around Ahmednagar in the last quarter of February, 1683. To expel them from that territory, Aurangzeb sent Tirandazkhan and others.[215] After that the Maratha troops went towards Pedgaon (Bahadurgad) in March, 1683. As a result, Shahajada Azzamshah sent the Mughal commander Dilawarkhan against those Maratha troops. Soon after that he also sent Mamurkhan, another Mughal general to render help to Dilawarkhan in his undertaking.[216]

While going to Pedgaon (Bahadurgad), Mamurkhan saw the Maratha troops at the town Ashte. When he attacked them, they fled. When the Maratha troops were at a distance of 35 Kos from Pedgaon (Bahadurgad), Mamurkhan and Dilawarkhan attacked and defeated them. Many soldiers from both the sides were killed in that engagement.[217]

In April, 1683, the Maratha troops again entered in the territory of Ahmednagar. Therefore, the Mughal commander,

---

214. Ibid., No.454, p.285.
215. Ibid., No.435, p.271; Gokhale-Sambhaji,p.285.
216. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.456, p.287.
217. Ibid., No.460,p.290.

Shirandazkhan went to fight against them from Ahmednagar. On the approach of the Mughal army the Marathas fled from that territory.[218]

Aurangzeb and the Kingdom of Bijapur - 1682 to August, 1683

When Aurangzeb saw that the kingdom of Bijapur gave help to the Svarajya against the Mughals, he decided to increase the pressure on Chhatrapati Sambhaji "by making a diversion against the Bijapuris and compelling them to concentrate their resources on the defence of their own realm.[219] For that he sent Ruhullahkhan in January, 1682, to invade the territory of Bijapur. Ruhullahkhan raided the villages and laid to waste the corn-fields of the Bijapur kingdom. In June, 1682, Aurangzeb also sent prince Azzam to invade the Bijapur territory. Prince Azzam ravaged the frontier territory of Bijapur and captured its fort of Dharwad (about 90 miles from Bijapur). Butas the force under him was inadequate to capture Bijapur he was not successful in capturing it. After that though Aurangzeb recalled prince Azzam in June, 1683, he again sent him against Bijapur in August, 1683.

Activities of Akbar - 1683

On 3rd January, 1683, Akbar seems to have reached Banda in the Portuguese territory. From that place he sent his

---

218. Ibid., No.465,p.296; No.468,p.299.
219. Sarkar-Aurangzib IV,p.302.
220. Ibid., p.304.

envoy to the Portuguese Viceroy. That envoy saw the Viceroy in the fort of Goa on 17th January, 1683, and presenting him the precious stones and the letter of Akbar told him that a quarrel had taken place between Sambhaji and Akbar.[221]

It seems that Akbar had requested the Portuguese Viceroy of Goa to give him some ships and the permission to go to Mecca through the territory of Canara. Accordingly, the Viceroy of Goa gave permission for five ships to Akbar.[222]

It appears that Akbar who was in financial stress had requested through his envoy Abdul Hamid to the Viceroy of Goa to allow him a facility sell his precious stones in the Goa territory and to write to the queen of Mangalore to give him ships (to go to Mecca). He had also requested the Viceroy to send to him certain things with his envoy. Accordingly, the Viceroy wrote to Akbar on 16th February, 1683, that he had sent the things which Akbar had asked for with his envoy and that he has written favourably to the queen of Mangalore about giving him (Akbar) facilities (to go to Mecca through her territory). The Viceroy further intimated Akbar that he had kept one ship ready at Panaji and unless he meets the two persons, whom Akbar was to send to see him, that ship will not go to the territory of the queen of Mangalore,[223]

---

221. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.108.
222. Ibid.
223. Ibid., Pp.108-109.

But it seems that Akbar could not go to Mecca at that time, for the envoy of Aurangzeb, Shaikh Mohammed, who was present in Goa since 21st January, 1683, came to know about the matter that with the help of the Portuguese Akbar was trying to go to Mecca. To that effect he alerted the Mughal officers of different areas[224] and due to that they seem to have taken steps to prohibit Akbar's going to Mecca. Similarly Aurangzeb also appears to have exerted pressure on the Portuguese, who later wards declined to provide a ship for Akbar to go to Mecca when he requested for it.[225]

When the Portuguese were not inclined to help him to go to Mecca, Akbar purchased one ship from one Muslim named Muhammad. That ship was sent by Muhammad to the port of Rajapur. But as it was very small in size, Akbar declined to go to Mecca by it. Moreover, Akbar does not seem to have felt safe to travel through it, as on the orders of Aurangzeb the Portuguese were conducting a pursuit of Muhammad (in order to capture him.).[226]

Sambhaji's Relations with the Kingdoms in South India

In his Karnataka expedition of 1676-1678, Chhatrapati Shivaji conquered and added to the Svarajya the territories of Jinji, Vellore, Kolar, Hoskot, Sira, Bangalore, Belapur, Chikkabellapur, etc. He then made arrangements for administration of the conquered territories in Karnataka

---

224. Ibid., p.109.
225. Ibid.
226. Ibid.

and returned to the Svarajya in April, 1678.

By that conquest of Shivaji the Svarajya became a new political factor in the Karnataka where different rival kingdoms were struggling to establish their political supremacy by fighting constant warfare against each ~~each~~ other. Due to those wars the rulers of the kingdoms of Mysore, Madura and Ikkeri in South India were not on good terms with each other. In the issue of that political supremacy in the Karnataka, the interests of the Bijapur kingdom were represented by its noble, Ekoji Bhosle (the son of Shahaji Bhosle and the younger step brother of Chhatrapati Shivaji), who had succeeded to the Bangalore jahagir after the death of Shahaji and had shifted his administrative seat from Bangalore to Tanjore after defeating Alagiri Nayak in 1675.[227] Mysore, which had opposed Shahaji, Ekoji and Chhatrapati ~~Sambhaji~~ Shivaji in Karnataka, came in serious conflict with Chhatrapati Sambhaji.

After the death of Chhatrapati Shivaji in April, 1680, when in the Svarajya a succession issue to his throne was being fought between Sambhaji and the adherents of Rajaram, Chikkadeva Raja, the ruler of Mysore, conquered Chikkatottagere, Magadi, Maddagiri, Kadur, Virannedurga, Channarayadurga, Bijjavara, Gundumaledurga and Bhutipura in the north of Mysore and which were of the Ikkeri kingdom posed a danger to the Maratha interests in Karnataka.[228] But the kingdom of Ikkeri, which was ruled by queen Channamaji on behalf of her adopted

---

227. Muddacheri, B., Mysore-Maratha Relations, Pp.63-64.
228. Ibid., p.90.

minor son, Basava Raja,[229] defeated the army of Mysore and conquered the territories of Kadur, Banavara, Hassan and Belur[230] and strengthened its defences against Chikkadeva Raja.

When Mysore was following such aggressive designs in Karnataka, sometime during December, 1680, and January, 1681, Sambhaji arrested Raghunath Narayan Hanamante, who probably was opposed to Sambhaji's succession to Shivaji[231] at Jinji and appointed Hirji Raja Mahadik and Shamji Naik Punde to look after the Maratha administration in Karnataka.[232] Accordingly, Sambhaji sent Hirji Raja Mahadik, Shamji Naik Punde, Jaitaji Katkar and Badji Kanda with an army to Karnataka sometime during 11th March, and 8th April, 1681.[233]

Hirji Mahadik (the husband of Ambikabai, the sister of Chhatrapati Sambhaji), who was appointed as the Subhedar of Jinji by Sambhaji, was a talented military general. He moved against Mysore and besieged its fort of Dharmapuri for eight months. When he was made to lift up that siege, he continued his war unsuccessfully against Mysore up to December, 1681.[234]

---

229. Kaladiya Nripa Vijayam, p.50.
230. Ibid., p.51.
231. Sardesai-Sambhaji, p.34. Hanamante was released in 1682 and after when he met Sambhaji in Maharashtra, Sambhaji appointed him as the Mujumdar. But Hanamante died in May, 1683, and was successed in his post by his son Raghunath, upto 1686, and then by Timaji (Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.348).
232. Jedhe Shakavali, Pp.30-31.
233. Ibid., p.31, Shrinivasachari, C.S., A History of Gingee and its Rulers, p.238.
234. Muddachari, B., Mysore-Maratha Relations, Pp.91-92; Apratima Vira Charitam, p.33.

A clash between Hirji Mahadik and the Kingdom of Mysore took place again when after 1681, Mysore claimed Trichinapoly which was under the control of Chokkanatha Nayak, the ruler of the Kingdom of Madura, which had become weak by that time. Hirji Mahadik decided to resist the unjust demand of Mysore for Trichinopoly as the possession of that city by Mysore would have brought constant friction of that state with the Svarajya, whose territory of Jinji was near Trichinopoly. Therefore, when Chokkanatha Nair of Madura formed a confederacy of Ekoji of Tanjore and the King of Ramand (Marva), to oppose Mysore's design to capture Trichinopoly, Hirji Mahadik joined them.[235]

In the war which ensued between that confederacy and Mysore, though Chikkadeva Raja defeated the generals of Hirji Mahadik in the battle of Srirangapatana, finally Hirji Mahadik defeated Mysore and captured its general Kumaraiya in the battle of Trichinopoly in 1682.[236] As a result of his success in the Trichnopoly war against Mysore, Hirji Mahadik, the Subhedar of the Svarajya, grew powerful and had his complete control over eastern Karnataka. He arrested the progress of Mysore in the South.[237]

---

235. Ibid., Pp.92-93.
236. Ibid., Pp.95-98.
237. Ibid., p.99. It is contended by Muddachari,B., (Ibid., Pp.100-103) that Sambhaji had formed a league with the Kings of Golkonda and Ikkeri and had led an expedition in Karnataka during 1681-1683. This seems to be improbable. For during that period Sambhaji was personally busy in his war against Siddis and the Mughals. As a result, we feel that it was either Hirji Mahadik or some other Maratha commander who must have fought against Mysore during 1681-1683.

After that defeat Chikkadeva Raja of Mysore entered into an alliance against the Marathas with the Mughal emperor Aurangzeb.[238] It does not seem that at that time Aurangzeb sent his army for the help of Mysore against Sambhaji. Therefore, " realising the futility of further resistence, Chikkadeva Raja (of Mysore) honourably entered into negotiation with the Marathas and thus brought the war to a close by paying them tribute".[239]

Sambhaji's Relations with the English - 1682 to August, 1683

We have already narrated the relations of Chhatrapati Sambhaji with the English upto January, 1682, in the section, 'Sambhaji's war against the Siddis of Janjira'.

After his withdrawal from the Janjira front in January, 1682, to the end of his reign in 1689, Chhatrapati Sambhaji was continuously busy in his warfare against Aurangzeb. In that eventuality, as Sambhaji seems to have thought it profitable to remain friendly with the English, he took steps by which the Maratha-English relations were friendly during the time of his reign.

In order to continue those friendly relations, Sambhaji sent Pralhad Niraji as his envoy to the English at Bombay in October, 1682.[240] It appears that Pralhad Niraji informed

---

238. La Missia Du Madura III, p.290; Muddachari, B., Mysore-Maratha Relations, p.103; Chikkadeva Binnapam, p.29.
239. Muddachari, B., Ibid., p.104.
240. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.137.

the Deputy Governor of Bombay that Aurangzeb intended to reduce Bassein and Daman, and take Bombay by surprise. Since this will be harmful for the interests of both, the Marathas as well as the English, Pralhad Niraji conveyed to the English the desire of Chhatrapati Sambhaji to have the alliance of the Svarajya with the English against Aurangzeb. As there did not take place any settlement about that alliance, Pralhad Niraji returned to the Svarajya[241] along with Henry Smith, the English envoy, who was sent by the English of Bombay to secure facilities of trade from Sambhaji in the Maratha territory in South India.[242]

The English envoy, Henry Smith, saw Chhatrapati Sambhaji and communicated to him the English request about trade facilities in the Maratha territory in South India. Chhatrapati Sambhaji agreed to give his Farman to that effect and asked Henry Smith to collect it after few days. But instead of waiting for that Farman, Henry Smith returned to Bombay as he got perplexed by hearing the disturbing news that the English Ship 'President' was attacked by the Maratha Ships as the Marathas had thought that the 'President' was the ship of the Portuguese.[243] That Farman seems to have been then collected by the English in October, 1683.[244]

---

241. Desai, W.S., Bombay and the Marathas, p.29.
242. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.138.
243. Bendre-Sambhaji, Pp.430-431.
244. Ibid., p.432.

As now a policy of friendly relations was pursued by Chhatrapati Sambhaji towards the English, his administrators of Jinji in South India gave facilities to the English in 1682. This is clear from the Cowl granted by Ambaji Pant, the Maratha Hawaldar of Tindevanam to the English Governor who was residing at Chinapatnam.[245] From that Cowl we come to know that Hirji Raja, the Maratha Subhedar of Jinji, had given his Cowl to the said English Governor. According to it the English people were allowed to increase their town (factory) of Conimer and were given permission to freely make the English settlements in any part of the Maratha territory which came under Jinji in South India. The Marathas had also agreed to help the English in their activity of importing and exporting goods at the place which were under (the factory of) Conimer.

Sambhaji and the Portuguese - 1680 to August, 1683

After the death of Chhatrapati Shivaji (3rd April, 1680), on 5th May, 1680, Sambhaji sent his proposals of peace with the Maratha envoy, Ramaji Naik to the Portuguese Viceroy of Goa.[246] The Viceroy of Goa expressed his happiness about the desire of Sambhaji for a treaty of peace and friendship with the Portuguese and with Ramaji Naik he sent his replies on 29th May, 1680, to the different items of the proposals made by Sambhaji. He further asked Sambhaji to send in

---

245. Records of Fort St. George - Letters to Fort St.George--1682, p.113.
246. Pissurlenkar-Portugej-Maratha Sambandha, p.87; Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.161.

future his envoy with a necessary authority to sign the proposed treaty on behalf of him (Sambhaji).[247] After that in June, 1680, Yesaji Gambhirrao was sent as an envoy by Sambhaji to the Viceroy of Goa. Through Yesaji Gambhirrao Sambhaji had again communicated his desire of a treaty of peace and friendship with the Portuguese. But since Sambhaji had not delegated any powers to Yesaji Gambhirrao to sign that treaty, the Viceroy of Goa kept that treaty pending and asked Sambhaji on 20th June, 1680, to send his fresh orders about it in order to settle it finally.[248]

It is not clear from the extant sources as to why Sambhaji of his own proposed a treaty of peace and friendship with the Portuguese and if he was sincere in it why he did not take suitable steps to give a final shape to it. It could be that since Sambhaji was busy during that period in his civil war against Chhatrapati Rajaram for the throne of Shivaji and it was only on 18th June, 1680, that he reached Raigad,[249] he might not have the required time to pursue the matters of the treaty of peace with the Portuguese. After becoming the master of the Svarajya, Chhatrapati, Chhatrapati Sambhaji does not seem to have a proper atmosphere around him for a long time in which he could think about finalizing the treaty of peace with the Portuguese. As has

---

247. Portuguese Daftar-Desai, Pp.24-25.
248. Ibid., p.25.
249. Sambhaji Shakavali, p.103.

been pointed out earlier, immediately after becoming the Chhatrapati he recast his administration in whose actual working, disturbance was created by Kavi Kalash, the Chandagomatya. Sambhaji also started his warfare against the Siddis of Janjira and committed a blunder of giving an asylum to prince Akbar against Aurangzeb. Then he was busy in putting down the plots of Annaji Datto and others against him upto September, 1681. During that period the administration of Sambhaji was not smooth. This is clear from the letter of the Viceroy of Goa written by him to Annaji Datto on 4th June, 1681. In it the Portuguese Viceroy stated "I feel that the present state of affairs (under Sambhaji) are not managed (properly) as those were under Chhatrapati Shivaji".[250] It seems from this that Sambhaji was in troubled waters during that period and as a result of that he allowed to slip out of his hands the opportunity to give final shape to the treaty of peace with the Portuguese, even though the Viceroy of Goa wrote about it to him on 4th June, 1681,[251] as well as repeatedly to Annaji Datto from 4th June, 1681to 26th July, 1681.[252] The inactivity on the part of Chhatrapati Sambhaji in the matter of giving final shape to the treaty of peace with the Portuguese seems to have been instrumental in creating

---

250. Portuguese Daftar - Desai,p.28.
251. Ibid., Pp.25-27.
252. Ibid., Pp.28-30.

doubts about his intentions in the mind of the Viceroy of Goa even though Sambhaji had removed Moro Dadaji, the Maratha Subhedar of Dicholi from that Subha when the Viceroy had complained about his high-handed methods in the administration, and had appointed Shivaji Badnaik in his place.[253]

In that atmosphere of doubt and the hostility which had developed in the Svarajya as Sambhaji gave asylum to prince Akbar, the Portuguese seem to have taken an adverse view about Sambhaji's efforts to occupy the island of Anjediv which was at a distance of twelve Kos from the town of Goa and near Karwar.[254] As Sambhaji had become more firendly with the Arabs, who were the enemies of the Portuguese, the Viceroy of Goa thought that a danger will be created to the Portuguese interests if Sambhaji will occupy that island.[255] Therefore, the Portuguese promptly occupied the island of Anjediv on 5th May, 1682, and constructed a strong fort on it for its defence.[256] When Sambhaji complained to the Viceroy of Goa about the Portuguese occupation of Anjediv, the Viceroy acquainted him with the fact that though the Portuguese were not in touch with it for a long time, Anjediv originally belonged to the Portuguese, actually from 1506, when they had constructed a fort on it.[257].

---

253. ~~Pissurlenkar-Ibid.,xx p.88x~~ Ibid., Pp.26-30.
254. Ibid., p.31, Pissurlenkar-Portuguese-Maratha Sambandha, p.87.
255. Pissurlenkar-Ibid., p.88.
256. Ibid., p.89.
257. Ibid.

After the episode of the Anjediv island, the Viceroy of Goa seems to have taken a positive stand against Sambhaji by helping the Mughals against him. For, when the Viceroy of Goa learnt about the coming of the Mughals in the Deccan for a war against Sambhaji, he issued orders to his officers at Chaul, Bassein and Daman to allow a passage to the Mughal army through the Portuguese territories.[258] The Portuguese also constructed a fort at Parsik, near the creak of Kalyan, when they learnt about the efforts of Sambhaji to construct a fort there in order to ~~construct~~ obstruct the Mughal ships which were to move in the Kalyan Bhivandi area.[259]

It appears that in the war of the Mughals against Sambhaji the Portuguese expected a Victory of the Mughals and for that reason they helped the Mughals to obtain from them the territory of South Konkan as was wished by them (the Portuguese) to possess that area since long.[260]

As a result of the co-operation of the Portuguese with the Mughals against him, Sambhaji's troops had started skirmishes against the Portuguese since May, 1681.[261] In January, 1683, when Sambhaji saw that the Portuguese had allowed the Mughal ships to carry grains through the Thana creek, Sambhaji opened a war front against the Portuguese

---

258. Ibid., p.90
259. Ibid., p.91; Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.168, F.N.1.
260. Pissurlenkar-Ibid.
261. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.169.

in North Konkan, through which they had given a passage to the Mughal troops against the Marathas.[262]

On 15th April, 1683, under the personal command of Sambhaji, one thousand cavalry and two hundred infantry Maratha troops attacked and sacked the Portuguese town of Tarapur. The Maratha troops also attacked the town of Bassein, Saiwana, etc., and captured two Portuguese priests.[263]

As a reprisal of this unproclaimed war of Sambhaji, the Portuguese put under arrest Yesaji Gambhirrao, the Maratha ambassador in the court of Goa, and captured the Maratha ships which were carrying rice from the Karnataka area to the Svarajya.[264] When the envoy of Akbar enquired about the arrest of Yesaji Gambhirrao, the Portuguese released him after a few days and allowed him to go to the Svarajya.[265]

It was in 1682 that the Portuguese territory of Cheul was attacked by the Marathas. They besieged the fortress of Cheul on 20th June, 1683, and attacked the Portuguese fort of Korlal (Marro de Cheul). But the Portuguese repulsed the Maratha attack on the Korlal fort. The siege of the fortress of Cheul was continued by the Maratha troops for the next six months under the command of Nilo Moreshwar, the Peshwa of Chhatrapati Sambhaji.[266]

---

262. Ibid.
263. Ibid., p. 170.
264. Pissurlenkar-Portugej-Maratha Sambandha, p.92.
265. Ibid.
266. Gokhale-Sambhaji, Pp. 173-174.

Deserters From the Svarajya to Aurangzeb

During the period 1680 to September, 1683 A.D. the following persons deserted the Svarajya and joined Aurangzeb.

The Zamindars of Khadgagad and the servant of Chhatrapati Sambhaji, Chimanaji,deserted the Svarajya and entered in the service of Aurangzeb on 6th April, 1682. He was given a Khilat by Aurangzeb.[267] Kanhoji Dakhani, the son of Tanaji Shirke and the cousin brother of Sambhaji's queen, Yesubai, went over to Aurangzeb from the Svarajya. He was made a Mansabdar of 5000 by Aurangzeb.[268] Shaikh Ibrahim, the Nayab of Sambhaji, also joined Aurangzeb and was given a Mansab of 2000 Jat and 200 Swars by Aurangzeb.[269] Kazi Haidar, a Vatandar in the Svarajya, left the Svarajya and joined the service of Aurangzeb on 29th June, 1683. He was rewarded by a Mansab of 2000 and rupees ten thousand along with a Khilat by Aurangzeb.[270] The servants of Sambhaji Ramraja and Pratapsing Rathod went over to Aurangzeb on 4th January, 1683.[271] Kazi Jahan of Rairi, who was a Munshi in the government of Sambhaji, deserted the Svarajya and joined Aurangzeb on 7th April, 1683. Aurangzeb thereupon gave him a Mansab of 1000 Jat and 1000 Swars.[272]

---

267. Massir-i-Alamgiri - Pagadi, p.22.
268. Ibid., p.23.
269. Gokhale - Sambhaji, p.305.
270. Massir-i- Alamgiri - Pagadi, p.25.
271. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI - No.399,p.244.
272. Ibid., No. 465, p.296.

In spite of these desertions, Chhatrapati Sambhaji not only rendered a stiff resistance to Aurangzeb but also succeeded without losing the territory of the Svarajya upto September, 1683, in carrying out successfully his aim of causing destruction in the Mughal territory and of not allowing the Mughal army to concentrate and undertake a united attack on him.

Chapter VII

SAMBHAJI'S WAR WITH THE MUGHALS

(SEPTEMBER, 1683 To 21st SEPTEMBER, 1687)

Sambhaji's War with the Portuguese (Continued)

As the Portuguese had a desire to possess the territory of South Konkan of the Svarajya and as the Portuguese Viceroy wanted to relieve the pressure of the Maratha besiegers on the fortress of Chaul, he opened hostilities against Sambhaji in South Konkan in September, 1683. For that, after coming to the Durbhat harbour of the Svarajya on 1st November, 1683, the Portuguese Viceroy attacked the fortress of Fonda which was on the border of the Svarajya and the Portuguese territory of Goa. Even though the Portuguese succeeded in creating a breach in the barican after long battering of the walls of that fort with their powerful guns, the Maratha soldiers managed to hold that fort against the Portuguese attacks upto 9th November, 1683. On 9th November, 1683, Chhatrapati Sambhaji, who had rushed from ~~Rajput~~ Rajapur with a relieving force to save the fort of Fonda from the Portuguese, reached that spot. Due to that " the Portuguese army was completely outflanked and lost heart, and none could resolve to prevent them (i.e. the Marathas)" from entering in the fortress of Fonda.[1]

---

1. Sarkar-Aurangzib IV, Pp.274-275; Pissurlenkar-Portugej-Marathe Sambandha, p.95.

Fearing that he would get trapped by the Maratha troops, who were inside as well as outside the fortress of Fonda, the Portuguese Viceroy, Francisco de Tavora, Conde de Alvor, somehow managed to retreat to Goa.[2] As Chhatrapati Sambhaji was highly pleased by seeing the valour with which the Maratha army of the fortress of Fonda had defended it against the Portuguese, he suitably rewarded his soldiers. For example, he sanctioned a permanent yearly payment of two hundred Hons to Krishnaji, a child of three years in age of Krishnaji Yesaji Kank, as Krishnaji Yesaji Kank had died due to the woulds he had bravely born while defending the fortress of Fonda against the Portuguese. That payment was sanctioned to Krishnaji till he reached maturity and became able to serve the Svarajya. In addition to that Sambhaji gave a cash reward of one thousand Hons to that child of Krishnaji Yesaji Kank.[3]

Chhatrapati Sambhaji then razed the severely damaged fortifications of the fortress of Fonda and constructed a new fort near that place. Sambhaji used the stone-slabs of the fortress of Fonda in the construction of that fort. The name of that fort was Mardangad.[4]

From Fonda, Chhatrapati Sambhaji marched against the city of Goa with his troops and on 24th November, 1683,

---

2. Manucci-Storia Do Mogor II, Pp. 246-248.
3. SCSK-II, No.397-400.
4. Sarkar-Auranzib IV, Pp.275-276; Pissurlenkar-Portugej-Marathe Sambandha, Pp.102-103.

conquered a fort of the Portuguese island Santo Estevao (St. Stephen). Seeing that, the Portuguese Viceroy attacked the Marathas on 25th November, 1683. In that fierce fighting, the Portuguese Viceroy was wounded and he escaped with great difficulty to the city of Goa. The Maratha army then pursued the Portuguese troops and tried to capture the city of Goa. But as the river Mandavi which they were required to cross to capture it had a sudden spate, they could not capture it. In order to lead an assault against the city of Goa, Chhatrapati Sambhaji tried to cross river Mandavi. It seems that Sambhaji, who was on the horse at that time was about to get drowned with it in that river. But with great courage and tact he was saved by Khando Ballal Chitnis.[5]

Chhatrapati Sambhaji suddenly withdrew from Santo Estevao (St. Stephen) in the afternoon of 26th November, 1683, probably because he wanted to escape from the encirclement of the Portuguese ships,[6] and the Mughal troops which had reached under Shah-Alam in the area of Ramghat which is only 30 miles north-east of Goa. After that, the Maratha troops attacked and looted the Portuguese territory of Salsette and Bardes on 11th December, 1683.[7]

Writing about the Maratha ~~troops~~ attack on the

---

5. Ibid., Pp. 103-105; Sanads and letters, No.61, Pp.218-219.
6. Pissurlenkar-Portugej-Marathe Sambandha, p.105.
7. Ibid., p.107.

territpry of Salsette, Pissurlenkar has stated that "the Marathascommitted outrage on many Christian women".[8] Kamal Gokhale has also expressed a similar view about the Maratha attack on the territory of Salsette by expressing that "the Maratha soldiers committed an outrage on 200 women who were in the Church of Margaon-five or six of them violated woman by lying with that woman alone.. As a result many women threw themselves into pools, where they died of drowning".[9]

It is difficult to agree with the views expressed by Pissurlenkar and Kamal Gokhale about the outrage committed by the Maratha soldiers who had attacked and looted the territory of Salsette in December, 1683. For, nothing about it has been stated by Manucci in his work, Storia do Mogor. As it is, Mannucci was present in Goa during the time of the Maratha-Portuguese war and he was in the close contact with the Viceroy of Goa, Francisco de Tavora, Conde de Alvor, and the Arch Bishop of Goa, Dom Manoel de Souza de Menezes.[10] Mannucci had hatred for persons of loose morals. Therefore, in his work he has expressed adverse opinion about Sambhaji[11] as he believed that Sambhaji's conduct towards women was not good. Had the Maratha soldiers committed atrocities on the women of Salsette as Pissurlenkar has contended or had they

---

8. Ibid., p.108.
9. Gokhale-Sambhaji, Pp.186-187.
10. Manucci-Storia Do Mogor II, p.244,269.
11. Ibid., p.190, 242, 291.

committed a gang rape on the women in the Church of Margaon as stated by Gokhale, there would have been surely a great uproar about it in Goa, and some thing of it at least would have reached Mannucci, who was in close contact with both the Viceroy and the Arch Bishop of Goa. In that case, we feel, Manucci would have certainly stated about it in a very strong manner in the Storia do Mogor. The fact that not even a smallest trace about that matter is found in the Storia do Mogor, a work which is very critical about Sambhaji, leads us not to agree with the views expressed by Pissurlenkar and Kamal Gokhale about the outrage committed by the Maratha soldiers in the territory of Salsette in December, 1683. This also leads us to set aside the view of J.N. Sarkar[12] about the same matter which he has based on the authority of Pissurlenkar.

When the Marathas had conquered the territory of Bardesh and Salsette and were planning to capture the island of Goa, Shah Alam, who was sent by Aurangzeb with a vast army across the Ramghat to put down the Marathas in Konkan[13] reached near that territory. Seeing that the Maratha troops would get trapped between the Mughal troops led by Shah Alam and the Portuguese army,[14] Chhatrapati Sambhaji withdrew

---

12. Bihar and Orissa During the Fall of the Mughal Empire, p.37.
13. Massir-i-Alamgiri-Pagadi,p.25; Khafikhan-Pagadi,p.7; Tarikh-i-Dilkusha-Pagadi,p.83.
14. Sarkar-AurangzibIV, p.277; Pissurlenkar-Portugej-Marathe Sambandha,p.110.

the Maratha troops from the territory of Goa and returned to Raigad on 23rd December,1683,[15]

Chhatrapati Sambhaji then gave full authority (Kul Yakhtayar), to Kavi Kalash[15 (a)] probably to settle the terms of peace with the Portuguese. On 3rd January,1684, four Maratha envoys approached the Portuguese with proposals of peace[16]. It seems that earlier to this attempt of settling peace with the Portuguese, Sambhaji had sent his envoy to them on 28th November, 1683; and in response to it, Manucci (the author of Storia do Mogor, who was on leave in Goa at that time) was sent by the Portuguese to Sambhaji to settle peace.[17] But the attempt of both the parties to come to terms was unsuccessful. As a result of the coming again of the Maratha envoys on 3rd January, 1684, it seems that the Portuguese took the matter seriously and finalised the terms of peace with Sambhaji sometime during 25th January, 1684, and 4th February, 1684, at Fonda.[18] In settling that peace, Kavi Kalash and prince Akbar played an important role to represent the Maratha side.

According to that treaty it was settled that the Portuguese territory conquered by Sambhaji would be resorted to them; both the parties should return the captured ships and

---

15. Jedhe Shakavali, p.33.
15(a) Ibid.
16. Pissurlenkar-Portugej-Marathe Sambandha, p.110.
17. Ibid., p.112.
18. Ibid., Pp.112-113. Pissurlenkar shows that the contention of the Jedhe Shakavali (p.33) that this peace was concluded in the forest of Bhimgad is not correct according to the Portuguese records.

the soldiers to each other, the Portuguese should pay the Chauth for the Gavakhadi and Daman areas in the territory of Bassein and Sambhaji should protect that territory; Sambhaji should pardon the Desais of Konkan, who had joined the Portuguese against him etc.[19]

But since Sambhaji seems to have solicited that peace, "not with the desire of maintaining the friendship of the Portuguese, but out of dread of the army of the Mughal King, fearing that the armies might join each other, and cause him greater harm," he did not ratify it after the Mughal army had retired from the territory of Goa.[20] As a result of that the Portuguese remained at war with the Svarajya during the entire reign of Sambhaji.

The Portuguese reconquered their territory in North Konkan which they had lost to Sambhaji[21] and they gave shelter and support against Sambhaji to the Desais of Sankhali, Dicholi and Padana of South Konkan.[22] The Portuguese also instigated Khem Sawant of Kudal and other Desais of Konkan to rise in rebellion against Sambhaji.[23] Their rebellions caused great loss to Sambhaji and except at Fonda the Maratha rule did not exist in the Goa territory by January, 1686.[24]

---

19. Ibid., Pp.113-115.
20. Pissurlenkar, P. , A Portuguese Embassy to Raigad in 1684, (Pro.AIHS,p.73)
21. Pissurlenkar-Portugej-Marathe Sambandha, p.127.
22. Ibid., p.124.
23. Ibid., Pp.125-127.
24. Ibid., p.127.

The war of Chhatrapati Sambhaji against the Portuguese was nothing but a corollary of his war against Aurangzeb. Had he entered into a treaty of peace with Portuguese prior to the coming of Aurangzeb to the Deccan, probably Sambhaji would not have been required so much to fritter away his time, energy and resources of the Svarajya in a prolonged activity of warfare against the Portuguese. It appears from the matters stated above that had Sambhaji been somewhat in good relationship with the Portuguese, he would have been able to use his resources more profitably to defend the Svarajya against the Mughals.

Mughal Penetration in the Konkan and the Disastrous Retreat of Shah Alam - September, 1683, to May, 1684

On 15th September, 1683, Shah Alam was sent by Aurangzeb to attack and conquer the Maratha territory of South Konkan.[25] Aurangzeb also deputed Shihabuddinkhan to conquer Kalyan and sent prince Azzam to the Nasik area to deal with the Marathas. Aurangzeb himself marched to Ahmednagar (November, 1683), and posted Bahadurkhan at Akolkot "to watch the Golkonda and Bijapur frontiers and prevent those powers from making any diversion in aid of the Marathas".[26]

Shah Alam was joined by Hassanalikhan when he marched to South Konkan. When the Mughal army reached the area

---

25. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha-Pagadi, p.83; Massir-i-Alamgiri-Pagadi, p.25.
26. Sarkar-Aurangzib IV, p.289.

of Belgaum, the Marathas opposed it. But with the brave and skilful generals like Ranmastkhan and Daudkhan, Shah Alam managed to conquer the cities and the forts from the Marathas in that area. After that Shah Alam crossed the Ramghat pass and came to Sawantwadi. During that time, as Sambhaji had concentrated his attention in conquering the city of Goa by an assault, the Mughal army could penetrate in South Konkan without much serious opposition.[27] As a result of the coming of the Mughal army in the area of Ramghat, which is only 30 miles north-east of Goa, Chhatrapati Sambhaji, as has been narrated earlier, was required to withdraw from the territory of Salsette and Bardash to avoid the encirclement of his troops by the Mughals. Thus Shah Alam's invasion of Konkan gave relief to the Portuguese.

From the neighbourhood of the city of Goa, Shah Alam went to Dicholi and destroyed there the mansions of Chhatrapati Sambhaji and Akbar.[28] From Vengurla, Shah Alam went to Malwan and from there returned to the bank of the Bardesh river, which is to the north of the city of Goa, in order to establish contact with his provision-vessels as his army had started suffering from shortage of food.[29] This was because a famine was raging in Goa at that time and Shah Alam could not secure a supply of corn from the

---

27. Ibid., p.290.
28. Pissurlenkar-Portugej-Marathe Sambandha, p.117.
29. Sarkar-Aurangzib IV, p.292.

area he had occupied.[30] When, by May, 1684, the Siddi of Janjira sent him provisions, Shah Alam set out on his return march according to the orders of Aurangzeb.[31] As he came with his army to the Ramghat pass, his army was struck by pestilence of such virulence that in a week one third of his troops died. Large number of horses, elephants and camels of that army perished and the soldiers had to trudge on foot.[32] In that circumstance when with great difficulty Shah Alam crossed the Ramghat pass and descended into the plains of Karnataka, the Maratha troops attacked him in all directions and cut off stragglers and plundered his baggage. Facing the Maratha attacks with great difficulty, Shah Alam reached near Indi. There he was supplied with the necessary provisions by Bahadurkhan. From there Shah Alam went and met Aurangzeb at Ahmednagar on 18th May, 1684.[33] "Thus ended in disaster the grand Mughal invasion of Konkan. The campaign must have resulted in a loss to the Mughals of at least fifteen thousand men and an equal number of animals".[34]

The dangerous circumstance through which the Svarajya passed during that time can be understood by us when we take into account that Shihabuddinkhan, who was sent by Aurangzeb to South Ratnagiri in order to effect the junction of his

---

30. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha-Pagadi, p.85.
31. Ibid. ; Sarkar-Aurangzib IV, p.292.
32. Manucci- Storia-Do-Mogor--II, p.269; Khafikhan-Pagadi, p.14.
33. Massir-i-Alamgiri-Pagadi, Pp.27-28.
34. Pagadi-Maratha Mughal Relations, p.35.

army with Shah Alam near Mahad, and when in that scheme Shihabuddinkhan had "gained many victories and looted Nizampur, 11 miles north of Raigad".[35] The danger posed to the Svarajya by Shah Alam and Shihabuddinkhan in the Konkan area was such that it led Chhatrapati Sambhaji to write an Ajnapatra to the Deshmukh of Wai and tell him that "since there was a great need to have large number of troops, he (Deshmukh) should exert to collect the troops (i.e. should recruit the troops)".[36] But that circumstance proved to be temporary. For, Shihabuddinkhan's descent in Konkan was more in the nature of a raid than an invasion. Taking into account the total effect of that Mughal penetration in the Konkan in the Mughal-Maratha warfare, it appears that "if the plan of Aurangzeb was that the army of prince Muazzam (Shah Alam) and that of Shiabuddinkhan should march from different directions and meet in Konkan, it failed miserably".[37]

The Maratha Raids in the Mughal Territories - September, 1683 to 1684

Aurangabad and Bid

It seems that in the last quarter of 1683, the Maratha troops attacked the Mughal territory of Bid and entered in the Aurangabad district.[38] It was reported by the Mughal

---

35. Sarkar-Aurangzib IV, p.292.
36. SCS Khanda II, No.271, p.267.
37. Pagadi-Maratha Mughal Relations, p.33.
38. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.472,p.304.

commander, Muzaffarkhan, the son of Khanjahan Bahadur (Bahadurkhan) to Aurangzeb on 8th January, 1684, that he had fought an engagement against the Maratha troops at Sarangpur (4 miles to the north-east of the Ambad town in the Ambad taluka). In it, seventy Maratha soldiers were killed. When he again attacked them in the night, a fierce engagement took place between the Mughals and the Marathas. Though 300 Mughal Mansabdars lost life in it, the Mughals managed to defeat the Maratha troops and capture their belongings.[39]

From the number of the Mughal Mansabdars who died while fighting against the Marathas it appears that a large number of the Maratha troops must have attacked the territory of Aurangabad in January, 1684.

After defeating the Maratha troops at Sarangpur, Muzaffarkhan pursued them for 20 Kos from Songaon (in the Bid district), and defeated them again at Pur (Mauj Puri). In that engagement, the Maratha generals, Jadhav and Kakoji were wounded by the Mughals. The Mughal troops also snatched horses, weapons, and other material from the Marathas.[40]

The Maratha troops then become active in the Paithan region of Aurangabad. Therefore, Aurangzeb sent his commander, Bahramandkhan against them.[41]

---

39. Ibid., No.475, p.306.
40. Ibid., No.476, p.308; Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.292.
41. Massir-i-Alamgiri-Pagadi, p.26.

On 13th January, 1684, Muhammad Sharif, a relative of Mulla Ahmad, the Mughal Thanedar of Patoda (to the south-west of Bid), reported to Aurangzeb that he had arrested two Maratha horsemen and one soldier who had come to collect the Chauth in the territory of the Bid district. Thereupon Aurangzeb ordered him to send them to Azzam Shah.[42]

The attempt of the Marathas to collect the Chauth in the Mughal territory indicates the great daring with which they were attacking and moving in the enemy territory.

Ahmednagar District

In January, 1684, Himmatrao, the commander of Sambhaji, had entered with his troops in the area of Sangamner. Therefore, Shivasingh, the Mughal Thanedar of Kankar (?) fought against him. In that battle he captured Himmatrao and sent him to Aurangzeb.[43]

The Maratha troops had again entered in that area in December, 1684. Thereupon Aurangzeb sent Itiquatkhan to fight against them.[44]

Thalner

In May, 1684, the Maratha troops had gone in the territory of Thalner in order to conduct loot. As a result, Kwaja Futuh, the Mughal commander, had gone to fight against them.[45]

---

42. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.479,p.311.
43. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.282.
44. Ibid., Pp.282-283.
45. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.480,p.312.

Junnar

The army of Chhatrapati Sambhaji had penetrated in the Mughal territory of Junnar in October, 1684. Therefore, Abulkhair, the son of Abdul Azizkhani the Mughal commandant of fort Junnar, fought against them. After defeating the Maratha troops, he captured their weapons and other material.[46]

After that in December, 1684, the troops of Sambhaji again entered in the Junnar area around the Mughal forts. They also caused destruction of the area around Belhe, the Mughal Thana in Junnar. But the Mughal commandant of Junnar, Abdul Azizkhan, and his son (Abulkhair), did not march against them. Therefore, emperor Aurangzeb, reduced their Mansabs on the grounds of their inactivity.[47]

Poona

In January, 1684, the Maratha troops had entered around the territory of Lohgad. As a result, Farvruddin, the Mughal Thanedar of Navalakh Umara, fought an engagement against them. In that engagement, after defeating the Maratha troops, he captured some Maratha soldiers along with their horses and other material.[48]

The Maratha army had also entered in the territory around Supe in November, 1684. The Mughal commander, Gaziuddinkhan Bahadur defeated them in an engagement.[49]

---

46. Ibid., No.498, p.322.
47. Ibid., No.535, p.345.
48. Ibid., No.474, p. 305.
49. Ibid., No.507, p.327.

Pedgaon (Bahadurgad)

Timaji, the commander of Chhatrapati Sambhaji, used to enter and disturb the Mughal territory of Pedgaon constantly. Therefore, to fight against him, Azzam Shah appointed Kishorsing Hada. In January, 1684, when Timaji had again entered in that territory, Kishorsing Hada defeated and captured him in a battle.[50]

Satara

In November, 1684, Naroji Bhosle, a commander of Chhatrapati Sambhaji, had reached near the fort of Satara with ten thousand troops. When the Mughal general Gaziuddinkhan learnt about, he proceeded 24 Kos from Shirwal and attacked Naroji Bhosle and degeated him. In that engagement 200 Maratha and 17 Mughal soldiers lost life.[51]

Nasik

The Maratha troops had disturbed the Mughal territory of Nasik in October, 1684. Therefore, Ikramkhan, the Mughal Thanedar of Nasik captured 20 Maratha soldiers out of them and sent them to Aurangzeb.[52]

Bagalana

In December, 1684, the Maratha troops had reached near the fort of Ramsej in Bagalana. Due to that, Ikramkhan the Mughal Thanedar, attacked and defeated them in a battle. In it 200 Maratha soldiers were killed and many were wounded by the Mughal army.[53]

---

50. Ibid., No.476, p.308.
51. Ibid., No.513, p.331.
52. Ibid., No.499, p.323.
53. Ibid., No.531, p.343.

The Mughal Activity Against the Marathas - September, 1683 to 1684

Sampgaon (Near Belgaum)

It seems that the fort of Sampgaon (near Belgaum) which was captured by Shah Alam in December, 1683, on his way to raid the Konkan territory,[54] was taken back by the Marathas. Shah Alam, therefore, seems to have conquered it again in January, 1684,[55] when he had returned from the Konkan and was going to meet Aurangzeb at Ahmednagar. Shah Alam then appointed Abdul Faiyazkhan as its commandant. That arrangement was confirmed by Aurangzeb.[56] After that on 18th May, 1684, Shah Alam met Aurangzeb at Ahmednagar.[57]

It appears that probably to attack the Svarajya Shah Alam left Ahmednagar and crossed the Bhima river with his army on 10th June, 1684. The Marathas then attacked the right and the left wings of his army. His non-combatants and the baggage, which had remained behind were attacked and looted by 25000 Maratha troops. That led Shah Alam to order the return of his army to fight against the Marathas. Probably on the return of that army the Maratha troops fled from the field.[58] After that it seems that on 12nd June, 1684, Shah Alam camped near Ahmednagar.[59]

---

54. Khafikhan-Pagadi, p.13; Pagadi-Maratha Mughal Relations, p.32.
55. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.475, p.307.
56. Ibid., No. 476, p.308.
57. Massir-i-Alamgiri-Pagadi, Pp.27-28.
58. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.484, p.314.
59. Ibid., No. 487, p. 315.

Sholapur

In his endeavour to check the raiding activity of the Marathas, Aurangzeb seems to have sent Bahadurkhan with an army in the southern direction from Ahmednagar. Bahadurkhan then defeated the Maratha troops, which had gathered together on the banks of river Krishna on 27th January, 1684.[60] It appears that on 14th May, 1684, Bahadurkhan also conquered the fort of Sangola from Marathas.[61]

Poona

The territory of Poona had become a target of the constant Mughal attacks. In January, 1684, the Mughal general, Shihabuddinkhan, penetrated in the Maratha territory and attacking the territory around Raigad and Kasaba Nizampur looted it. In that activity he captured two thousand people and six thousand animals of the Marathas. Aurangzeb then gave the title of Rahamat Yad (Yar ?) to Shihabuddinkhan in the appreciation of his valour.[62]

In December, 1684, Aurangzeb sent Bahramandakhan, Abdulwahidkhan, the Baxi of Prime Kambaksh. Muhammad Taki, a relative of Bahramandakhan; Mamurkhan, Sayyidkhan, Muhammadali, the Diwan of the army of Sayyidussadat; Tuhafkuli, Haji Muhammad Salih, Jan Muhammad, Diler Beg, the son of Alam Gurjabdar; Muhammad Mumi Daruga, to fight against the Marathas with

---

60. Massir-i-Alamgiri-Pagadi, Pp.26-27.
61. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.481, p.312.
62. Ibid., No.471, p.303.

3280 soldiers[63] in the territory of Poona. This shows that the Marathas were very active in that territory in December, 1684.

Kalyan-Bhiwandi

Kazi Haider, his brother's son Kazi Muhammad, and Abdul Kadir, a relation of the late Musvliskhan, managed to secure the help of Ramaji, a Zamindar in the area of the fort Kothala, and captured that fort from the Marathas by deception. They shouted and told falsely the persons in that fort that they had brought grains to store in the fort and made them to open the gates. After the gates were opened, they fought against those persons and captured that fort in November, 1684.[64].

After that the Marathas besieged that fort in order to conquer it from the Mughals. Therefore, Abdul Kadir, who was in that fort requested help from Aurangzeb to hold that fort against the Marathas. Aurangzeb then sent the Mughal general Abdul Karim and others for the help of Abdul Kadir.[65]

Abdul Azizkhan, the commandant of the fort of Junnar, to whom also Aurangzeb had ordered to go for the help of Abdul Kadir, the commandant of fort Kothala in November, 1684, reported to Aurangzeb that when the way towards

---

63. Ibid., No.520, Pp.335-336.
64. Ibid., No.510, Pp.328-329.
65. Ibid., No.511, p.330.

that fort was blocked by Naroji, the commander of Sambhaji, Abulkhair, the son of Abdul Azizkhan, attacked and captured Naroji. He also reported that soon after the capture of Naroji, Abdul Kadirkhan, the Mughal Thanedar of Karus; Manakoji, the Mughal Thanedar of Shikarpur, and Raajandazkhan the Mughal Thanedar of Karde-Nimone, reached that spot. They, then, attacked the Maratha troops and killed many of them in a battle.[66]

About that battle it was reported to Aurangzeb by Manakoji Pandhare, the Mughal Thanedar of Shikarpur, that he and the above stated Mughal Thanedars killed Naroji Trimbak and Severed his head. He sent the head of Naroji Trimbak along with his report with Udaji to Aurangzeb. Aurangzeb then ordered to hang the head of Naroji Trimbak on a street.[67] Aurangzeb also gave a Khilat as a reqard to Udaji, who had carried the head of Naroji Trimbak to him.[68] In December, 1684, Aurangzeb named the fort of Kothala as Miftahulfutuh.[69] Then, in the same month, Aurangzeb ordered Marahamatkhan, the Mughal general, to go to the fort of Kothala and asked him to remain alert there against the Marathas. He also gave 2500 Hons as a reward to Govindrao and other Mavales, who had helped the Mughals to capture the fort of Kothala.[70]

---

66. Ibid., No.514, Pp.331-332.
67. Ibid., No.515, Pp.332-333.
68. Ibid., No.516, p.333.
69. Ibid., No.530, p.342.
70. Ibid., No.531, p.343.

Nasik

Out of the three settlements (Wadis) of Trimbakeshwar, the Mughal general, Bahramandkhan, had burnt two settlements. But the Marathas rehabilitated those settlements again. Therefore, Akramkhan, the Mughal Thanedar of Nasik(Gulshanabad), and the Mughal general Marahamatkhan, went to Trimbakeshwar, and after reducing those settlements to ashes, captured men and animals of those settlements.[71]

As the Marathas often used to penetrate in the territory of Nasik, and as the supply of grains was made from it to the Svarajya, Aurangzeb ordered Sayyad Munavvar, the Subhedar of Burhanpur, who was at Nasik in December, 1684, to establish a permanent military post at Pimpalgaon. He also ordered him to see that no supply of grains from that area was made to the Svarajya. He also asked him to see that the Maratha troops did not penetrate in that area.[72]

The Maratha Counter Attacks - 1685

The extant historical data proves that the Marathas had conducted a vigorous activity against the Mughals in 1685. They penetrated at several points in the Mughal territories and carried out their aim of causing great damage in those areas. The following recorded data amply proves that contention.

---

71. Ibid., No.518, p.334.
72. Ibid., No.532, p.343.

Nasik and Bagalana

In January, 1685, the Maratha troops had entered in the Mughal territory of Nasik(Gulshanabad). On getting that news, Aurangzeb ordered his general Iatikadkhan to proceed to that area with troops against the raiding Marathas.[73]

The intensity of the Maratha raids on the territory of Nasik seems to have increased in February, 1684. For, after getting the news of those raids,Aurangzeb sent his general, Atishkhan, to fight against the Marathas in that area. He also ordered Raadandazkhan to proceed from Karde-Nimone; Maramhamkhan to proceed from Navalakh Umara; and Muhammad Khalil to proceed from Shivaneri, to Gulshanabad (Nasik)[74] in order to deal effectively with those raiding Maratha troops.

On 2nd February, 1685, it was reported by Bahramandkhan to Aurangzeb that the raiding Maratha troops were capturing men and animals from the Mughal territory of Bagalana. He, therefore,fought against them at Mulher. In that battle, Bahramandkhan not only defeated the Maratha troops, but after killing and wounding many of them, captured their weapons and horses.[75]

The Maratha troops had also reached near Hanavantgad in the territory of Bagalana. As a result, Bahruzkhan, the

---

73. Ibid., No.541, p.350.
74. Ibid., No.562, Pp.367-368.
75. Ibid.

Thanedar of Thalner, sent Muhammad Ismail to fight against them. On 5th February, 1685, Bahruzkhan reported to Aurangzeb that in a battle, Muhammad Ismail killed many Maratha soldiers and secured victory for the Mughals.[76] It seems that battle was fought at Nasik (Gulshanabad). For, it is reported in the Mughal Akhabar of 6th February, 1685, that the Maratha troops who had fled from Gulshanabad went near the territory of Bagalana and were defeated by the son of Atishkhan.[77] Some of those Maratha troops fled in the direction of Berar and Khandesh and were pursued by Munawarkhan. On learning about that from Akramkhan, the Mughal Thanedar of Gulshanabad, Aurangzeb ordered Maramahatkhan and Raadandazkhan to go in chase of those troops.[78] He also ordered Gazinddinkhan, who was at Poona, to proceed to Gulshanabad with troops to fight against the Marathas. Accordingly, Gaziuddinkhan carried out the orders of Aurangzeb.[79]

The Maratha troops had also reached near Hanavantgad. But they were defeated by the Mughal Thanedar of Chandor on 18th February, 1685.[80]

Poona

Under the leadership of Chhatrapati Sambhaji the Marathas undertook a vigorous military activity against

---

76. Ibid., No.565, p.370.
77. Ibid., No.566, p.371.
78. Ibid., No.566, p.371.
79. Ibid., No.567, p.372.
80. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.234.

the Mughals in 1685 in territory of Poona where the Mughals had penetrated.

The Marathas attacked the southern territory of the Poona district in January, 1685. On 4th January, 1685, Bahramandkhan the Mughal Thanedar of Shirval, reported to Aurangzeb that the troops of Sambhaji had come near Parner in order to fight against him. On that, Aurangzeb ordered Iatikadkhan and Mirzakhan to proceed to that area with 2780 soldiers in order to fight against those Maratha troops.[81] In spite of that also, the Maratha troops seem to have continued their constant and vigorous attacks in that territory. For, on 15th January, 1685, Bahramandkhan again reported to Aurangzeb that he was required to go to Karde Nimone and Shikarpur (Shikrapur) from Shirval in order to fight against the Marathas. It was also reported to Aurangzeb on the same date that out of the 2000 Bullock-loads of grains which Muhammad Ismail Gurjabdar had sent from the government camp to Bahramandkhan at Shirval, 1700 Bullock-loads of grains were looted by the Marathas. As a result, only 300 Bullock-loads of grains could reach to the Mughals at Supe.[82]

The Marathas attacked the Mughal Thana of Shirval continuously in 1685. In November, 1685, the Maratha troops had reached near that Thana. With them the Mughals fought a stiff battle. In it three sons of Naharkhan,

---

81. Ibid., No.539, p.348.
82. Ibid., No.548, p.357.

the Mughal commander,were wounded. After that the Mughal army entered in the Maratha territory of Rohidkhore and attacked the territory of Maval of the Svarajya.[83]

The Maratha troops were very active in the northern territory of the Poona district in January, 1685. Therefore, Fakruddinkhan, the Mughal Thanedar of Poona, defeated them in a battle.[84] Another Mughal Thanedar of Poona, Raadandazkhan, reported to Aurangzeb on 13th January,1685, that 1000 troops of Sambhaji had come to the territory under his control. As his fighting with those troops was still going on, he requested Aurangzeb to send help to him as he had less number of troops to meet the attacks of the Marathas. Therefore, Aurangzeb sent 1455 cavalry troops for his help under Ilhayar Beg, the son of late Mughalkhan.[85]

The Maratha troops had also penetrated in the territory of Navalakh Umare in January, 1685. The report about that was given to Aurangzeb on 13th January, 1685, by Abulkhair, who was at the Thana of Navalakh Umare . Since he also reported that the troops under him were not adequate to meet the Maratha attacks, Aurangzeb ordered Atishkhan to go to Poona and then to proceed to the Thana of Navalakh Umare for the help of Abulkhair;[86] and on 14th January, 1685, Aurangzeb sent Izzakatkhan, the Mir Bakshi of Shah Alam,

---

83. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.271.
84. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.545, p.353.
85. Ibid., No.546, p.354.
86. Ibid., No.546, p.355.

and his son along with 700 cavalry troops with Atishkhan to Navalakh Umare.[87].

It appears that by October, 1685, the Mughals had succeeded in capturing the fort of Rohida from the Marathas. Therefore, the Maratha troops tried to regain it from the Mughals by conducting an assault on it. It was reported to Aurangzeb by the Akhabar of 25th November, 1685, that the Marathas were attacking that fort for 10 days from 29th October, 1685, onwards and in the fighting which took place between them and the Mughal troops, 300 Maratha soldiers were killed and many Maratha soldiers were wounded. Due to the stiff Mughal resistance, the Maratha troops finally fled from that place and the Mughals managed to capture 100 lances, 100 horses, 30 Maunds of gun powder , and a gun mounted on a carriage.[88]

It appears that Sarjerao Jedhe, who was sent by Chhatrapati Sambhaji to capture the fort of Rohida from the Mughals, succeeded in capturing it[89] by the end of 1685.

The Marathas also tried to expel the Mughals from the south-eastern territory of the Poona district in which they had established their Thana at Supe. The Maratha troops had entered in that territory in January, 1685. Therefore, on 7th January, 1685, Raadandazkhan, the Mughal Thanedar of

---

87. Ibid., No.547, p.356.
88. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.276.
89. SCSK II, No.239, p. 234.

Supe wrote about them to Aurangzeb. As he reported that he had only 504 cavalry troops to deal with those Marathas, Aurangzeb ordered Lutfullakhan to appoint additional 480 cavalry troops[90] (for the help of Raadandazkhan).

In the north-eastern territory of Poona the Marathas launched attacks on the Mughals in January, 1685. Therefore, it was reported to Aurangzeb on 12th January, 1685, by Khoja Hamid, who was at Karde Nimone, that he did not have adequate troops to meet those Maratha attacks. But instead of sending additional troops for his help, Aurangzeb wrote to him that the troops which he (Khoja Hamid) had were adequate to fight against 1000 Maratha troops. Aurangzeb further communicated to him that if the Marathas will attack him in large numbers, he should keep himself at his place as the measures to deal with them would be taken by Aurangzeb himself.[91]

After that, on 21st January, 1685, Khoja Hamid reported to Aurangzeb from Karde Nimone that 700 Maratha troops had come to Malthan (6 Kos from Karde Nimone) and then had gone to Shirur. He also reported that the Marathas had kept the captured men and animals from that area at Shirval, and had wounded two persons of that place. When he reported that he did not have a place to keep safely

---

90. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.542, p.350.
91. Ibid., No.545, p.353.

the sutlers and followers and baggage of his army, Aurangzeb asked him to construct a protective wall around the small fortress of Karde Nimone and to keep them inside it while leaving on expeditions.[92]

The Maratha soldiers constantly moved in the territory of Karde Nimone in the night time. News of that was communicated to Aurangzeb on 29th January, 1685, by Khoja Hamid. He reported that 50 Maratha soldiers were constantly comming to Rahu (7 Kos from Karde Nimone) in the night time. On that Aurangzeb ordered Marahamatkhan to send a Mansabdar with troops to Rahu[93] in order to deal with those Maratha soldiers.

In February, 1685, Khandoji, the commander of Sambhaji, had laid siege to Sarasgaon. It was reported by Khoja Hamid to Aurangzeb on 10th February, 1685, that when Khandoji's troops had come to attack him, he defeated and pursued them upto the river Bhima and managed to recover from them the camels and other animals which they had earlier captured from the Mughals.[94]

Satara

When the Maratha troops were going to the area of Devasha, the Mughal commander, Amanullahkhan, galloped from Shirwal and fought against them. In a battle he killed many of those troops. After that the remaining troops fled

---

92. Ibid., No.553, Pp.359-360.
93. Ibid., No.558, p. 364.
94. Ibid., No.568, p. 373.

from that territory. He reported about that matter to Aurangzeb on 1st March, 1685.[95]

On 5th March, 1685, it was again reported to Aurangzeb by Amanullahkhan that he defeated the Maratha troops who had come to Chandan-Vandan and after killing many of them in a battle, captured their horses, men, and guns.[96]

In May, 1685, the Marathas had also entered in the hills of Satara. For, it was reported on 25th May, 1685, by Gaziuddinkhan to Aurangzeb that when Hambirrao, the commander-in-Chief of Sambhaji and other Maratha nobles had collected themselves in those hills, he sent his troops to deal with them. Those troops attacked the Marathas and killed many of them. After defeating the Marathas the Mughals then established their Thana in that area.[97]

In spite of that, the Marathas continued to attack that area. For, it was reported to Aurangzeb on 29th May, 1685, that Tajkhan, the Mughal Thanedar of Shirwal, and others had rendered a great service while fighting against the Maratha troops.[98]

Junnar

It seems that the troops of Chhatrapati Sambhaji had penetrated in the Mughal territory of Junnar in April,1685. Therefore, the Mughal Fauzdar of Junnar, Sayyid Izzatkhan,

---

95. Ibid., No.573, p.377.
96. Ibid., No.574, p.378.
97. Mughal Darbarchi Batamipatre-Pagadi, (BIAS,XI, No.44,p.39)
98. Pagadi-Mughal Darbarachi Batamipatre, (BIAS,XI,No.44,p.39)

was required to fight against them. On 13th April, 1685, he sent to Aurangzeb the weapons and the men which he had captured from those Maratha troops in a skirmish.[99]

Osmanabad District

In January, 1685, the Maratha troops of Sambhaji were active in the Osmanabad District. On 30th January, 1685, the Mughal messengers reported to Aurangzeb that the Maratha troops come from the territory of Parinda and disturb the area of Osmanabad. Due to that Aurangzeb directed Ghaznafarkhan to go to that territory in order to put down those Maratha troops. In order to put down the Marathas who were disturbing the villages around Kadirabad, Aurangzeb then deputed Sayyad Oghalan and Multafitkhan, the Bakshi of Prince Shah Alam.[100]

Accordingly Sayyad Oghalan went to that territory and on 31st January, 1685, he reported to Aurangzeb that the Maratha troops had fled from that territory.[101] But the Marathas again came to that territory. For, it was reported on 1st February, 1685, by Ghaznafarkhan to Aurangzeb that the Maratha troops which had come four Kos near Kadirabad fled away and he will continue their pursuit till the time he gets orders from Aurangzeb. Aurangzeb then asked him to pursue those troops upto the Bhima river.[102] It seems

---

99. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.600, p.393.
100. Ibid., No. 559, p.365.
101. Ibid., No. 560, p.366.
102. Ibid., No. 561, p.367.

from this that the Marathas used to disturb, damage and loot the territories of the Mughals and used to go away from those territories in order to avoid pitched battles against the Mughal troops which Aurangzeb used to send to fight against them. By employing that strategy Chhatrapati Sambhaji saved his man power and also successfully achieved his aim of causing damage in the Mughal territories in order to cripple down the economic base of the Mughal army.

In the last week of February, 1685, Sambhaji's commander, Rana Jaisingh, reached near the fort of Parinda with the troops under him. On getting that news, Aurangzeb sent Marahamatkhan, the son of Namdarkhan, to fight against him on 26th February, 1685.[103] By the time Marahamatkhan could reach that territory, Rana Jaisingh was killed in a battle on 27th February, 1685, which was fought against him between Indapur and Adgaon by Bahadurkhan, who had come down a distance of 15 Kos from Balawani. In that battle Bahadurkhan captured a number of horses, weapons, etc., from those defeated Maratha troops.[104]

Ahmednagar

In January, 1685, Sambhaji's troops looted men and animals of the Mughal territory around Sangamner. But as the Mughal Thanedars of that area did not fight against them, Aurangzeb reduced their Mansabs.[105]

---

103. Ibid., No.570, p.374.
104. Ibid., No.571, p.375.
105. Ibid., No.541, Pp.349-350.

As the Maratha troops had entered in the area of Parner, Aurangzeb ordered Ghaznafarkhan to go to fight against them with 700 cavalry troops. He also ordered Abdul Karim, the Thanedar of Parner, and Khoja Hamid of Karde-Nimone to co-operate with each other and fight against the Maratha troops.[106]

On 24th January, 1685, it was reported to Aurangzeb that Ghaznafarkhan had gone to Parner with his troops, but the Maratha troops had fled from that territory by the time he reached it.[107]

Tal Konkan

The Marathas tried to capture Kothalagad from the Mughals in January, 1685.

It was reported to Aurangzeb on 1st January, 1685, that the troops of Sambhaji had entered in the Kothalagad in the dark of the night. But Sayyad Abdul Karim, the Mughal commandant of Kothalagad, became aware of their entry and he put on the light in the fort. After that the Mughal troops fought with arrows and guns with the Marathas. The Maratha troops then fled from the fort. It was also reported to Aurangzeb that the people in that fort are put to great difficulties as they do not receive the supply of grains. Therefore, Aurangzeb ordered Abul Khair,

---

106. Ibid., No. 552, Pp.358-359.
107, Ibid., No. 555, p. 361.

the Fauzdar of Junnar to supply food grains to Kothalagad.[108]

After that, 7000 Maratha troops had again gone to attack Kothalagad. But the Mughals killed and wounded many of them.[109]

Kalyan-Bhiwandi

In March, 1685, Saifullakhan was attacked by the Marathas in the Kalyan-Bhiwandi area. In the skirmish, which took place between the Mughals and the Marathas, Jivaji, the brother of Manakoji Pandhare of Shikrapur, did not help Saifullakhan. Therefore, Saifullakhan removed Jivaji from service.[110] This shows that the Marathas were trying to reconquer the territory lost to the Mughals in the Kalyan-Bhiwandi area in 1685.

Sholapur.

In April, 1685, Sudaji, the commander of Sambhaji, had entered in the territory of Sholapur. Therefore, the Mughal Thanedar of Shirval sent Muhammad Thanedar to fight against him. He then defeated Sudaji in a battle on 22nd April, 1685, and recovered 31 horses and some lances from the Marathas which they had looted earlier from the people of that area. The Mughal general, Abu Muhammad also succeeded in capturing the family of Sudaji at Nadarballa (?).[111] The recorded data proves that the

---

108. Ibid., No.538, p. 347.
109. Ibid., No.547, p. 356.
110. Ibid., No.577, p. 380.
111. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.290.

Maratha troops were carrying out their aim of looting and disturbing the Mughal territory in 1685.

Berar

On 8th April, 1685, Sihab, the Mughal Thanedar of Akola, arrested a Maratha spy when he was conducting the activity of spying in the Akola district of the Mughals. Sihab then sent that spy to Aurangzeb.[112] It appears from this data that the Marathas were trying to collect the information from the Mughal territories in order to plan their future expeditions against the Mughals.

The Mughal Penetration in the Svarajya - 1685

The Mughals were exerting to penetrate in the territory of the Svarajya and to carry out destruction in it. In January, 1685, the Mughal general, Gaziuddinkhan, proceeded from Poona and after reaching near Nizampur, set fire to 3 Maratha villages. He captured men and animals from those villages. After that he went to the Wadi (Pachad) of Raigad where Sambhaji was present along with his relatives. When Sambhaji got the news about the coming of the Mughal troops he went to Raigad with those relatives. Gaziuddinkhan then looted the Pachad Wadi, Nizampur and other places. When he was having his camp at a distance of 2 Kos from Raigad, he was attacked by Hambirrao Mohite, the Commander-in-Chief of Sambhaji, and Rupaji Bhosle, who were sent against him with

---

112. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.599, p.393.

15000 Maratha troops by Sambhaji. But Gaziuddinkhan defeated them; and pursued them upto a distance of 7 Kos. Gaziuddinkhan then returned to his camp and looted the prosperous area around it. He then proceeded to the Miftahutfutuh pass.[113]

It seems that while pursuing those Maratha troops, Gaziuddinkhan had reached near Gangoli. There, Kavi Kalash, the Chandogamatya of Chhatrapati Sambhaji, fought against him and made him to retreat on the Ghat.[114]

Aurangzeb and the Kingdom of Bijapur - September, 1683, to September, 1686

From Bijapur, Prince Azzam was transferred by Aurangzeb to Nasik in October, 1683. With this, the "desultory attacks on Bijapur ceased for a time".[115] After that in November, 1683, Aurangzeb personally came to Ahmednagar to direct the Mughal operations against Bijapur. Therefore, to help Bijapur against the Mughals, Sambhaji seems to have sent his generals and the army in January, 1684. For, it was reported to Aurangzeb on 12th January, 1684, that Ruhullahkhan had defeated Janrao, Jadhavji, the commanders of Sambhaji, at Indiah (Indi ?) and had killed one thousand Maratha troops in a battle against them. Ruhullahkhan also defeated the 3000 Bijapur troops who had come to help the Marathas.[116]

---

113. Ibid., No.554,p.360; No.555,p.361; No.556, p.362.
114. Jedhe Shakavali, Pp.32-33. In the Shakavali, Shahabuddin, which was the other name of Gaziuddinkhan, has been given.
115. Sarkar-Aurangzeb IV, p.304.
116. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.478, p.310.

In February, 1684, Aurangzeb asked Prince Azzam and the Khan-i-Jahan to establish a number of outposts in the north-west and north-east respectively in the Kingdoms of Bijapur. "The great energy thrown by both sides into the Maratha war throughout 1684 prevented the Mughals from undertaking any serious enterprise against Bijapur. Moreover, during the first half of the year, the disastrous march of Shah Alam into the Konkan diverted all the imperial resources into that quarter. Bijapur was besieged in right earnest only as late as March, 1685."[117]

By the time the Mughals besieged the city of Bijapur, great changes had taken place in the internal affairs of the Kingdom of Bijapur. Siddi Masud, the Vazir of Bijapur, who was not successful in either restoring order or in reforming government in the Bijapur kingdom, had resigned his post in November, 1683, with a desire "to create for himself an independent principality in the Karnul district safe beyond the Krishna and Tungabhadra, in view of the rapidly approaching extinction of the Adil Shahi monarchy".[118] Therefore, Aga Khusrau became the Vazir of Bijapur on 19th March, 1684.[119]

On 30th March, 1684, emperor Aurangzeb, by writing a letter called upon the Adil Shah to supply provisions to the Mughal army, allow the free passage to the Mughal army through the Bijapur territory; supply 5 or 6 thousand cavalry

---

117. Ibid., Pp.303-304.
118. Ibid., Pp.304-305; Busatinussalatin-Parasnis-Bendre, p.586.
119. Busatinussalatin-Parasnis-Bendre, p.594.

for the war of the Mughals against Sambhaji, abstain from helping Sambhaji, and expel Sarjakhan, who was entrusted the task of defending Bijapur against the Mughals by Adil Shah in March, 1684.[120]

In reply to that letter, the Adil Shah sent his communication to Aurangzeb in which he asked him to return to him the tribute and Bijapur territory the Mughals had exacted in the past; withdraw the Mughal outposts from his dominions; march against Sambhaji from the Mughal territory only and never make peace with Sambhaji till the Mughals had recovered from him and restored to Bijapur all its territory conquered by Shivaji and Sambhaji. The Adil Shah also refused to banish Sarjakhan.[121]

By seeing that reply of the Adil Shah, Aurangzeb gave up the show of friendship which he had so long kept with Bijapur. Aurangzeb became convinced about the firm resolve of the Adil Shah to support Chhatrapati Sambhaji against the Mughals. Therefore, Aurangzeb on the one hand had ordered his generals to plant outposts in the Bijapur territory, and on the other, he kept on sending robes of honour and letters to Adil Shah.[122]

Seeing that attitude of Aurangzeb towards Bijapur, though Adil Shah also pretended that he would be preparing

---

120. Ibid., Pp.594-595; Nayeem, M.A., External Relations of the Bijapur Kingdom (1489-1686), p.179.
121. Ibid., Pp.595-596.
122. Sarkar-Aurangzib IV, p.306.

a contingent to cooperate with prince Azzam to fight against Sambhaji; in actuality he started his effort to seek allies against the Mughals. On 30th July, 1684, the Adil Shah sent his envoy to Golkonda to secure its help against Aurangzeb. The Bijapur troops also attacked and defeated severely prince Azzam in August, 1684.[123]

In October, 1684, Aga Khusrau, the Vazir of Bijapur died[124] and Sarjakhan, the Bijapur general continued the opposition of Adil Shah to the Mughals.

In January, 1685, Kutub Shah of Golkonda promised ~~him~~ his help to Bijapur against Aurangzeb. In February, 1685, Melgiri (Nilgiri) Pandit was sent by Chhatrapati Sambhaji with Maratha troops to help Bijapur against the Mughals.[125] After that the Maratha and the Bijapur troops had camped at a distance of 15 Kos from the camp of Prince Azzam and were making preparations to attack the Mughal camp. When Azzam learnt about it, he attacked and killed many of them.[126]

Seeing that the Adil Shah was preparing for a war against the Mughals, Aurangzeb asked Kutub Shah of Golkonda to discontinue his help to Bijapur[127] and ordered the Mughal troops to besiege the city of Bijapur in March, 1685.[128]

---

123. Ibid., p.307.
124. Busatinussalatin-Parasnis-Bendre, p.597.
125. Ibid., p.599; Sarkar- Aurangzib IV, p.307.
126. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.580, p.382.
127. Busatinussalatin-Parasnis-Bendre, p.598-599.
128. Sarkar-Aurangzib IV, Pp.307-308.

On 5th April, 1685, Khan Jahan Bahadur, reported to Aurangzeb that as was ordered, he had conquered the fort of Nagathana of Bijapur. He further reported that he had laid trenches to the fort of Bijapur after reaching there by way of Rasulpur.[129]

When the city of Bijapur was besieged by the Mughal troops, the Kutub Shah sent his troops for the help of the Adil Shah. Chhatrapati Sambhaji also sent the Maratha troops again on 10th December, 1685, under Hambirrao Mohite to help Bijapur in its war against the Mughals.[130]

The Adil Shah sent Hambirrao Mohite to loot the territories held by the Mughals.[131] It seems that Hambirrao and his Maratha troops not only looted and attacked the Mughal territories, but they succeeded in cutting down the supply of materials and water of the Mughal army which had attacked Bijapur.[132]

In spite of the fact that the Kingdom of Bijapur put up a stiff resistance to the vast Mughal forces with the help of Chhatrapati Sambhaji and Kutub Shah, Sikandar Adil Shah surrendered to Aurangzeb on 12th September, 1686[133] as he was unable to defend himself against the Mughal armies. "The deposed Sultan(of Bijapur) was enrolled among the Mughal peers with the title of Khan (lord) and a pension of one lakh of rupees a year was settled on him"(by

---

129. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.595, p.391.
130. Busatinussalatin-Parasnis-Bendre,p.602.
131. Ibid.
132. Ibid., p.603.
133. Ibid., p.607; Sarkar-Aurangzib IV,p.324; Nayeem,M.A.,-External Relations of the Bijapur Kingdom(1489-1686 A.D.) p.180.

Aurangzeb).[134] By that came to an end the Kingdom of Bijapur in the Deccan to save which from time to time from Aurangzeb, Chhatrapati Shivaji and Sambhaji had exerted with the help of their slender resources of the Svarajya.

Aurangzeb and the Kingdom of Golkonda - 1685 to September, 1687

When Aurangzeb started war with the Bijapur kingdom in order to conquer it, Tanashah of Golkonda promised his help to Bijapur in January, 1685.[135] At the time when the Mughals had besieged the city of Bijapur in March, 1685, Tanashah was keen in helping Bijapur against Aurangzeb. He tried to send a large army for the help of Bijapur, but the road was blocked by the Mughal general Bahramandkhan. He wanted to send another army under the command of Ibrahim Khalilullahkhan. He communicated his intention to that effect to his envoys at the Mughal court. He wrote in it that "he had respected the Emperor (Aurangzeb) as his elder till then; but as His Majesty had taken advantage of Sikandar's youth and had besieged Bijapur, he could not sit complacently. It would be, therefore, quite correct if Raja Sambha (Sambhaji) were to send reinforcement to Bijapur while he (Tanashah) would send a large army consisting of 40,000 horse under Khalilullahkhan, and

---

134. Sarkar-Aurangzib IV, p.325.
135. Busatinussalatin-Parasnis-Bendre, p.599.

would then see how and where the Mughals would face them". Tanashaha's attempt to send that army was failed by Aurangzeb when he came to know about it through the censorship of that letter in the Mughal camp.[136]

Seeing the defiant attitude of Tanashah towards the Mughals, Aurangzeb sent his troops to attack the kingdom of Golkonda on 27th June, 1685, under Shah Alam and Khan Jahan Bahadur.[137] Against that Mughal army, a struggle of varying fortunes was conducted by the generals and the army of Golkonda upto October, 1685.[138] In October, 1685, when the Mughal army arrived in the vicinity of Hydrabad, the capital city of Golkonda, Tanashah fled to the fort of Golkonda for protection even though his wise Vazir, Madanna, had advised him not to shut himself in that fort but to go to Warangal or some other distant fort and remain free to deal with the Mughal army.[139] After that when the Mughal army under Shah Alam conquered the city of Hydrabad on 8th October, 1685, Tanashah sent his agents to Shah Alam and sued for peace. On the recommendation of Shah Alam, Aurangzeb consented to pardon Tanashah on the conditions that he must pay the arrears of his past tribute and dismiss his Vazir, Madanna, and Akkana, the brother of Madanna.[140] But upto September, 1685, the Sultan did not

---

136. Sherwani, H.K., History of the Kutb Shahi Dynasty, p.642.
137. Golkondyachi Qutbshahi-Bendre, p.132.
138. Sarkar-Aurangzib IV, p.342.
139. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha-Pagadi, Pp.88-89; Sarkar-Ibid., p.346.
140. Golkondyachi Qutbshahi-Bendre, Pp.135-136.

dismiss, Madanna and Akkana. He also did not make full payment of the arrears of his tribute to Aurangzeb.[141]

Meanwhile, in March, 1686, the discontented Muslim nobles of the Golkonda court formed a plot against Madanna and murdered him in the streets of the city of Golkonda.[142]

As Sultan Abul Hassan had not fully paid the arrears of tribute, emperor Aurangzeb, in September, 1686, personally marched against Golkonda. In January, 1687, the Mughal army under him besieged the fort of Golkonda in which Sultan Abul Hassan had taken shelter. The Mughal siege of the Golkonda fort went on upto the 21st September, 1687, when Aurangzeb managed to capture it by bribery.[143] By that Aurangzeb became a master of the kingdom of Golkonda.

When the Mughal troops under Aurangzeb had besieged the fort of Golkonda, the Maratha troops of Chhatrapati Sambhaji "infested the roads and prevented the transport of grain to the Mughal camp",[144] Except that activity which created some difficulties in the attempts of the Mughal troops to conquer the fort of Golkonda, the extant sources do not give any information about the other activity of Chhatrapati Sambhaji to help thekingdom of Golkonda against the Mughals. It seems that due to the stress which the Svarajya had started experiencing in its

---

141. Ibid., Pp.136-137.
142. Sarkar-Aurangzib IV, p.351.
143. Ibid., p.382.
144. Ibid., Bendre-Sambhaji, p.504.

conflict with the Mughals it was that Chhatrapati Sambhaji could not render any effective help to Sultan Abul Hassan to save Golkonda from emperor Aurangzeb.

Aurangzeb's Arrangement to Safeguard the Routes

When the siege of Bijapur was in progress, Aurangzeb had made effective arrangements to deal with the Marathas. In order to guard the Sholapur route against the Marathas he had appointed Itequadkhan (later the great Mughal general, Zulfikarkhan).[145]

When Aurangzeb left for Golkonda, he posted Prince Azzam at Nasik in order to watch the movements of Prince Akbar and the Marathas. Rustumkhan, a general of Bijapur, who was also known as Sarjakhan, had joined the Mughals after the fall of Bijapur. He was appointed by Aurangzeb to capture Satara. The Mughal had captured Miraj in April, 1686.[146]

Sambhaji had posted Hambirrao in the area of Satara. To guard the approaches of the Mughals to Konkan, Sambhaji had posted Peshwa Nilakantha Moreshwar at Rajmachi. He also put the Poona and Maval territory of the central districts of the Svarajya under the charge of Shankaraji Narayan, who was his minister since 1685. The charge of the Kudal territory was given by Sambhaji to Ramchandrapant.[147]

---

145. Pagadi-Maratha Mughal Relations, p.46.
146. Ibid., p.47.
147. Ibid.

Maratha Attacks on Mughal Territories - 1686

In October, 1686, Chhatrapati Sambhaji had sent his troops in the area of Mangalvedhe. Therefore, Aurangzeb sent Iteqadkhan to fight against them.[148]

This shows that the Marathas had been active in the Sholapur district in 1686.

The Mughal Advance in the Bagalana - 1686

Since the time Daulatmandkhan, the Mughal commander, became the Mughal Thanedar of Lohaner, he made efforts to conquer the Maratha forts in Bagalana.

According to the orders of Aurangzeb, Daulatmandkhan besieged the Maratha fort of Kanera (7 miles to the north-west of Dhodap in the hills of Chandavad), which was in Kalval Taluka of Nasik district, on 31st March, 1686. The attacks which the Mughals led on that fort were repelled by the Marathas. After that Daulatmandkhan tried to seduce Balaji More, the Maratha commandant of the fort of Kanera. Balaji More then defected to the Mughals on the condition that Aurangzeb should give him the Vatan of Javali which Shivaji had forcibly acquired from the ancestors of Balaji. He also asked for suitable Manasabs for himself as well as for his colleagues. Balaji asked for a Farman to that effect from Aurangzeb, and showed his preparedness to hand over the fort of Kanera to the Mughals and thereby help them in reducing other Maratha forts in Bagalana. Daulatmandkhan then sent one elephant, 5 horses and five

---

148. Massir-i-Alamgiri-Pagadi, p.33.

thousand rupees to Balaji. After that Balaji delivered the fort of Kanera to Daulatmandkhan in May, 1686. The 400 Marathas, who were in that fort then surrendered to the Mughals.[149]

Sambhaji and Akbar - September, 1683 to February, 1687

It appears that Akbar who wanted to go out of India, managed to secure a ship to go to Macca sometime in November, 1683; and before 23rd November of that year, he seems to have made an effort to go out from the Svarajya. But he was pursuaded in not doing so by Kavi Kalash and Durgadas who met him on that ship. That led Akbar to change his mind, and he did not sail for Macca.[150]

It is possible, that Sambhaji, who was at war with the Portuguese since December, 1682,[151] might have asked Kavi Kalash and Durgadas to pursuade Akbar in not going to Macca as he seems to have thought that it will not be good if the Portuguese will capture Akbar and use him in the war against the Svarajya which was going on.[152]

After that when Sambhaji withdrew from the Portuguese territory of St. Stephen (Santo Estevao) on 26th November, 1683, in order to avoid the encirclement of his troops by the Portuguese navy and the Mughal troops which were advancing towards that island.[153] After learning that

---

149. Pagadi,S.M.-Bagalanacha Daulatmandkhan Yachi Patren (BIAS, XI,No.42,Pp.72-73).
150. Gokhale-Sambhaji,p.109.
151. Pissurlenkar,P., A Portuguese Embassy to Raigad in 1684,(Pro.AIMHC,P.66).
152. Gokhale-Sambhaji,p.109.
153. Pissurlenkar-Portugej-Marathe Sambandha,Pp.103-107.

Shah Alam had advanced nearer to his troops, Sambhaji went to Raigad on 2nd January, 1684.[154] Earlier to that, Sambhaji seems to have sent his envoy to settle the terms of peace with the Portuguese on 28th November, 1683.[155] It seems that the terms of peace were settled between Sambhaji and the Portuguese sometime during 25th January, 1684, and 4th February, 1684.[156]

Akbar, who was present with Sambhaji on the island of St. Stephen, played an important role along with Kavi Kalash to settle the terms of peace between Sambhaji and the Portuguese.[157] For, we find that the Portuguese envoy, who settled the terms of peace with the Marathas, presented articles of gold to Akbar along with Sambhaji, Durgadas, Kavi Kalash, and others.[158] Moreover, on the document of that settled peace, we find the seal of Akbar in addition to that of Chhatrapati Sambhaji.[159]

After playing an important role in settling the peace between Chhatrapati Sambhaji and the Portuguese at Fonda, Akbar seems to have gone to the place (Jaitpur) at which after his quarrel with Sambhaji he had burnt his house

---

154. Ibid., p.110.
155. Ibid., p.112.
156. Ibid.,p.113. Pissurlenkar, on the basis of the Portuguese documents shows that the entry of the Jedhe Shakavali(p.33) which says that the peace between the Portuguese and Sambhaji was concluded when Kalash and Akbar went in the forest of Bhimgad on 17th January, 1684, is not correct (Ibid., Pp.112-113). It is not known exactly as to what did they attend by going to the forest of Bhimgad. It seems they attended something to which Akbar calls as "trouble of Bhimgad",(Sarkar-House of Shivaji,p.209).
157. Gokhale-Sambhaji, Pp.109-110
158. Pissurlenkar-Portugej-Marathe Sambandha,p.111.
159. Ibid., p. 114.

UNIVERSITY OF LISBON

and had started for Goa in February, 1683.[160] At Jaitpur, Akbar seems to have received a communication from Kavi Kalash in which he seems to have intimated Akbar that "an envoy of (Shahajada) Muhammad Azzam has arrived (to the court of Sambhaji)".[161] But as Kavi Kalash did not write to Akbar as to why for that envoy had come on 27th July, 1684, Akbar wrote in his letter to Kavi Kalash that "It is not known to me why he (the envoy) has come and what agreement you have made with him. If you consider it to be expedient for yourself, make peace; otherwise I am not myself much inclined towards peace. There is no harm in your writing in reply, but your coming (here, that is at Jaitpur) is necessary as many Raj Karanas (state counsels; deep and political projects) will be accomplished by that. You know best of your future benefit".[162]

Kavi Kalash did not send a reply to the above letter. After learning that he was sick, Akbar wrote another letter to Kavi Kalash on 20th August, 1684.[163] In it he again enquired from Kavi Kalash as to what the envoy of Shahajada Azzam had stated and what agreement he had made with that envoy. Akbar also asked Kavi Kalash to let him know as to how the peace affair with the Portuguese was concluded, as he did not know about it even though he had

---

160. Sarkar-House of Shivaji, p.209; Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.110.
161. Sarkar-Ibid.
162. Ibid., Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.110.
163. Sarkar-House of Shivaji, p.210.

acted as an intermediary in the settlement of that peace.

After the above letter, Akbar wrote different letters to Kavi Kalash[164] and showed his eagerness to meet him. He also wrote a letter to Chhatrapati Sambhaji and expressed his wish that Sambhaji should see him.[165] But it is not known from the extant sources whether, as was desired by him, his meetings with Kavi Kalash and Sambhaji had taken place.

It seems that sometime before 27th November, 1684, a person sent by Akbar and an envoy of Chhatrapati Sambhaji had seen the Mughal general Gaziuddinkhan with some proposals. It is probable that by those proposals, Sambhaji and Akbar were trying to come to terms with the Mughals. But since Gaziuddinkhan had no authority to entertain those proposals he sent away the person sent by Akbar and the envoy of Sambhaji.[166]

During this time (end of 1684), it appears that Zinatunnisa Begam, the daughter of Aurangzeb, wrote a letter to Akbar. As a result of that Akbar wrote a letter in reply to Zinatunnisa Begam. He also addressed a letter to Aurangzeb. In both those letters, Akbar prayed for pardon for all his offences (he had committed towards Aurangzeb). That led Aurangzeb to send him a letter in

---

164. Ibid., Pp.210-211.
165. Ibid., Pp.211-212.
166. Farsi Sahitya Khanda, VI, No.519, p.335.

reply. In it Aurangzeb asked Akbar to come to him without any doubt in mind.[167] But as Aurangzeb does not seem to have in reality pardoned his offences, Akbar does not seem to have gone to him.[168]

In December, 1684, the envoys of Akbar and Chhatrapati Sambhaji submitted to Aurangzeb their proposals of peace. But Aurangzeb turned down those proposals and said that "with him a settlement will be effected by the use of sword".[169]

At the time when he made that effort to settle his matters with Aurangzeb, Akbar was staying at Sakharpa and Malkapur.[170] It seems that from either of those places, Akbar wrote a letter on 18th January, 1685, to Chhatrapati Sambhaji and communicated in it his compliments for the repulse of the Mughal attack made by Kavi Kalash. Bestowing lavish praise on Kavi Kalash, Akbar wrote to Sambhaji that he (Kavi Kalash) being a faithful and brave servant of Sambhaji, Sambhaji should protect him from the jealousy of his other courtiers".[171]

---

167. Futuhate Alamgiri- Pagadi, p.21.
168. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.112.
169. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.522,p.337; No.523,Pp.337-338.
170. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.112.
171. Sarkar-House of Shivaji,p.212. About the repulse of the Mughal troop's attack by Kavi Kalash stated in this letter, Sarkar feels that it pertains to the repulse of Mughal general Shahabuddinkhan on 14th January,1685, when Shahabuddinkhan had descended the Bhor Ghat at Gangoli, stated in Jedhe Shakavali, p.33.

It appears that in February, 1685, either Zinatunnisa, the daughter of Aurangzeb, or Aurangzeb himself had made an attempt to effect the return of Akbar from the Maratha camp. For, we get the information that from the Mughal camp the teachers of Akbar, Shaikh Mir Adal and Muhammad were given a Khilat and sent to him with some message. Similarly, in the same month (February, 1685), Aurangzeb had sent Saifullakhan to Akbar who seems to have gone to Shirwal from either Sakahrpa or Malkapur at that time.[172] While doing this, it seems that Aurangzeb sent Shahajada Azzam to block the passage of Akbar, who probably was trying to go with an army to the North at that time. Accordingly, Shahajada Azzam reached Gangapur (in the Aurangabad district). Therefore, Akbar escaped from that territory to fort of Salher and then to Hanavantagad in Bagalana. When Shahajada Azzam reached that territory, Akbar again came to Salher and from there going to the territory of Konkan went for shelter in the fort of Mahuli.[173]

Akbar was tired by now of his wandering course of life. Therefore, he wanted to beg again the pardon of his offences to Aurangzeb. But it was due to the advice of Durgadas that he did not beg it.

It seems that from Mahuli, Akbar went to Kalyan and Bhiwandi. After staying there for two or three days, he came

---

172. Farsi Sahitya Khanda VI, No.570,p.374;No.571,p.376.
173. Futuhate Alamgiri-Pagadi, p.20.

Near Panhalgad. There, a fierce battle took place between him and the Mughal troops. It seems that as a result of his defeat in that battle Akbar again returned to the mountainous regions as his way to go ahead of Pamhalgad was blocked by the Mughal army.[174] This battle seems to have taken place near Chakan.[175] Probably seeing that Aurangzeb and the Mughal army was engaged in conquering the kingdom of Bijapur, Akbar seems to have made a strenuous effort during this time with the help of ten thousand Maratha troops under him to escape from the Svarajya and to go to north of India.[176]

When this attempt of Akbar to go to north India failed, he became much disheartened. Moreover when he saw that by that time the condition of the Svarajya had become critical due to the continuous Mughal attacks on it since 1681 and that Sambhaji, being more worried now about defending the Svarajya than to take active interest in seeing that Akbar went safely to north India, Akbar decided to leave the Svarajya and go to Iran for asylum. For his going to Iran, he purchased two ships and sailed for that country from the port of Rajapur in February, 1687.[177] After the departure of Akbar to Iran Durgadas Rathod also left the Svarajya and sent to Marwad.[178] Even though Akbar and Durgadas, to whom

---

174. Ibid.
175. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha-Pagadi, p.92; Gokhale-Sambhaji,p.114.
176. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha-Pagadi,p.92; Gokhale--Ibid.
177. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha-Pagadi,p.94.
178. Futuhate Alamgiri-Pagadi, p.25; Khafikhan-Pagadi,p.12.

Chhatrapati Sambhaji had given an asylum, had left the Svarajya, Aurangzeb continued his warfare against Sambhaji.

It is clear from the above that it was a blunder on the part of Chhatrapati Sambhaji to give asylum to Akbar. By that Sambhaji hastened the coming of Aurangzeb to the Deccan and landed the Svarajya in great difficulty by 1689. Had Sambhaji not given an asylum to Akbar, he would have probably gone to Persia, as no power in India would have given asylum to him against mighty Aurangzeb. In that case, thinking about the Persian invasion on India, which had earlier loomed during Aurangzeb's reign and due to which Aurangzeb had not come to the Deccan to put down Shivaji, Aurangzeb would have remained fixed in the North after the Rajput war. This appears to be certain because when Akbar went to the Persian court, the Kings of Persia, "Shah Sulaiman, and after him his son Shah Hussein, shewed him a generous and unwearing kindness till the time of his (Akbar's) death in Persia in 1706".[179]

Writing about the asylum given by Sambhaji to Akbar, Sardesai, G.S. has not taken into account the fact that there did not exist the support of the Rajput rulers of Mewad, Raipur, and others to Akbar against Aurangzeb after Akbar fled from Rajputana and was given an asylum

---

~~179. Futuhate Alamgiri Bagadi;~~

179. Kincaid, C.A. and Parasnis, D.B., History of the Maratha People II, p.33.

by Sambhaji. In fact, as has been shown, the Rana of Mewad, soon after Akbar was given an asylum by Sambhaji, concluded a treaty with the Mughals which was favourable to Aurangzeb. From the time of that treaty onwards we do not find that the Rana of Mewad had done anything to support Akbar against Aurangzeb. Similarly, Raja Ramsingh of Jaipur seems to have only shown his lip-sympathy towards the cause of Akbar against Aurangzeb. This is clear from the letter of Chhatrapati Sambhaji to him which is written by Sambhaji as a reply to Ramsingh's letter in which Ramsingh had given a counsel to Sambhaji that he (Sambhaji) should not oppose Aurangzeb but should accept the Mughal suzerainty. As a result, we are required to set aside the view expressed by Sardesai that "the rulers of Udaipur, Jodhpur, and of other Rajput states were urging upon Sambhaji to come in the north with Akbar",[180] as they were "in full support of Akbar and Durgadas" (against Aurangzeb).[181] It is clear from the facts stated earlier that there did not exist the support of the Rajput rulers to Akbar and hence Chhatrapati Sambhaji was unable to go to the north with Akbar and Durgadas.

Similarly we cannot agree with Bendre, V.S. when he says 'by giving asylum to Akbar, Sambhaji wanted to cause the risings of the Hindus and the Rajputs (in north India),

---

180. Sardesai-Sambhaji, p.69.
181. Ibid., p.29.

who were hurt by the imposition of the Jizia on them by Aurangzeb. Taking into account the existing (political) circumstance of that time, it was beneficial to Sambhaji to give asylum to Akbar".[182] For, as is pointed out by Bendre himself, both, Shivaji as well as Sambhaji had no experience of a good behaviour of even the Rajputs like Jaisingh and Jaswantsingh[183] and the Rajputs had made a fiasco of Akbar's stand against Aurangzeb in Rajaputana.[184] In view of these facts it does not appear to us that with an anticipation of getting the Rajput support against Aurangzeb it was that Sambhaji gave an asylum to Akbar. As we have shown on the basis of the Ajitodaya, it seems that Sambhaji himself was not prepared to give asylum to Akbar but he gave it due to the insistance of Kavi Kalash. This proves that Sambhaji did not use his earlier political experience which he had earned under Shivaji but played in the hands of an immature political person in the foreign policy matters of the Maratha state. Bendre has also not taken into account the fact that Sambhaji was already at war with the Siddis of Janjira at the time when he gave asylum to Akbar and had thereby unnecessarily invited Aurangzeb with his full strength against the Svarajya.

---

182. Bendre-Sambhaji, p.189.
183. Ibid., p.188.
184. Ibid., p.214.

Sambhaji's Relations with the English -1683 - 1687

The Maratha-English relations became more friendly as a result of a revolution which took place at Bombay in December, 1683, in the management of its government. In that month, under Captain Richard Keigwin, all the troops and the people of Bombay island rose in rebellion against Mr. Charles Ward, the Deputy Governor and his government of Bombay as they had a dissatisfaction about their inefficient rule and the timid policy they pursued towards the Siddis and the Mughals.[185] Keigwin, who arrested Mr. Charles Ward, established his control on the island of Bombay and was appointed as the Governor of that place by King Charles II of England on 28th December, 1683.[186] By that, the island and the Government of Bombay was transferred from the East India Company and it came under the King of England at that time.

In his relations with different powers, Keigwin showed much prudence. For example, when in April, 1684, the Siddi of Janjira who was the cause of the strained relations between the Marathas and the English, as usual sailed into the harbour of Bombay without permission, Keigwin informed him that "his men were not to land except for water, and that his fleet would not be permitted to remain in the

---

185. Desai,W.S. - Bombay and the Marathas, Pp.29-33.
186. Gokhale - Sambhaji, p.142.

harbour".[187] As the Siddi saw that Bombay was fully fortified, he soon left for Surat. The firm stand of Keigwin gave relief to both, the people of Bombay as well as the Marathas. Keigwin also sent safely to the Svarajya a Maratha ambassador of Chhatrapati Sambhaji, who was in the custody of a Mughal General, who wanted to put him to death, but realizing that on Bombay exists the rule of King Charles II, he handed over that ambassador to Keigwin in January, 1684.[188]

As a result of these things of the English Government of Bombay under Keigwin, Chhatrapati Sambhaji had now no cause of grievance against the English, and he desired to come to a friendly understanding with Keigwin. Seeing that desire of Sambhaji, Keigwin sent Henry Gary and Wilkins to the court of Chhatrapati Sambhaji in April, 1684.[189] When they communicated to Sambhaji the English desire to have their factories in the Maratha territory in Karnataka, he sent along with them his agreement and contract to that effect to Keigwin.[190] When its details were agreed to by Keigwin, Chhatrapati Sambhaji entered into a treaty of peace and friendship with the English in 1684.[191] According to that treaty Sambhaji gave facilities of trade and movement of goods to the English in the Svarajya. He

---

187. Desai, W.S.,-Bombay and the Marathas, p.33.
188. Bendre-Maharashtretihasachi Sadhane II, No.153,p.180; Gokhale-Sambhaji, Pp.143-144.
189. Bendre-Sambhaji, p.437.
190. Bendre-Maharashtretihasachi Sadhane,II No.157,Pp.182-184.
191. Ibid., No.158, Pp.184-188.

promised facilities to the English to open their factories at Nagothana and Pen and made it clear to them that they will not buy any subject of the Svarajya to make him a slave or a Christian. He also agreed to help the English in their differences with the Siddis of Janjira. Chhatrapati Sambhaji seems to have concluded this treaty with the English probably because he did not want them to throw the newly established Government of Bombay under Keigwin into the arms of his enemies namely, the Mughals and the Portuguese.

Shortly after this, Keigwin, according to the orders of the King of England handed over the island of Bombay to the East India Company. Sir Thomas Grahantham, Vice-Admiral, who accepted it for the Company, delivered it to the Commissioners of Surat.[192] Though the Government of Bombay again went under the East India Company, it continued the friendly relations which Keigwin had established with Chhatrapati Sambhaji.

As a result of their friendly relations with the Svarajya the English at Bombay refused in July, 1685, a permission to the Siddi of Janjira to stay in the island of Bombay.[193] Since now the English pursued a policy of not allowing facilities of shelter to the Siddis on the Island of Bombay , the Svarajya suffered less from the menace of the Siddis of

---

192. Desai, W.S.,- Bombay and the Marathas, p.34.
193. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.150.

Janjira during the reign of Sambhaji. By this time the policy of the East India Company had also changed. It now decided not to tolerate the daily affronts, great indignities, and often slightings of the Mughals given to its members but to meet force by force.[194] To resist the oppressions of the Mughals, the English started regarding Chhatrapati Sambhaji as an ally as he was already at war with Aurangzeb.[195]

Since now the English policy was to resist the Mughals, the English decided in March, 1686, to supply Chhatrapati Sambhaji the gun powder, great guns and shots, and small arms, whenever he desired those annually.[196] The English Governor of Bombay, Sir John Child, in his bid to obtain Maratha help against the Mughals, entered into a treaty with Chhatrapati Sambhaji in September, 1687, and undertook the work of protecting the creeks and mouths of the rivers along the Maratha coast in order to save the territories of the Svarajya from the attacks of the Siddi. For that Sambhaji had agreed to give to the English rupees fifty thousand and two thousand Khandis of rice.[197] Even though the English carried out promptly their undertaking for three months, Chhatrapati Sambhaji did not pay them the promised money and rice.[198] As a result, in December, 1687,

---

194. Desai, W.S.-Bombay and the Marathas, p.36.
195. Ibid., Pp. 36-37.
196. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.155.
197. Ramdas Ani Ramdasi, Sar.IV,Mani IX,(Shake,1865)Lekhanka 46, Pp.52-53; Desai,W.S.-Bombay and the Marathas,p.40.
198. Ramdas Ani Ramdasi, Ibid.

the English seem to have given up their undertaking which they had accepted by the above treaty.

After that also the English continued to remain in friendship with Sambhaji till the time he was captured by the Mughals in February, 1689.

Maratha Affairs in Karnataka - September, 1683 to September, 1687

After his alliance with the Mughals Chikkadeva Raja of Mysore became more friendly with Aurangzeb in order to seek his support against the Svarajya and the other rulers of Karnataka. His army assisted Aurangzeb in the reduction of the Kingdom of Bijapur and Golkonda in 1686 and 1687 respectively. As a result of that assistance "Aurangzeb could count upon Chikkadeva Raja as his ally in arresting the progress of the Marathas (Svarajya) in the south (Karnataka)".[199]

When the Mughal siege of Bijapur was going on the Marathas brought under their control the forts and territories of Karnataka which were of Bijapur,[200] probably with the feeling that those would be captured either by Chikkadeva Raja of Mysore or by Aurangzeb as Bijapur was struggling for its existence against the Mughals and was not able to defend them effectively against the enemies.

---

199. Muddachari, B., - Mysore-Maratha Relations, p.104.
200. Ibid., p. 106.

In the meanwhile, the fall of Bijapur into Mughal hands in September, 1686, and the siege of Golkonda undertaken by Aurangzeb awakened Sambhaji to the danger to his possessions in the Karnataka by an extension of Mughal authority in that direction. Therefore, as a defensive measure for that Sambhaji sent Keshav Pingle and Santaji Ghorpade with 12000 horse southwards in October, 1686, in order to strengthen his garrisons in the Karnataka.[201]

This step of Sambhaji alarmed Aurangzeb and he sent some of his troops under Kasimkhan from Golkonda to invest Bangalore which was in the hands of the Ekoji. When Ekoji was transacting the sale of Bangalore because of the constant attacks on it of Mysore, with Chikkadeva Raja of Mysore for three lakh rupees, Kasimkhan attacked and captured it on 10th July, 1687. Kasimkhan then sold it to Chikkadeva Raja for the same amount.[202] Aurangzeb then appointed Kasimkhan as the Fauzdar of Karnataka making Sira as his capital.[203]

Ekoji of Tanjore who had supported Sambhaji in his war against Mysore, probably died in August, 1687.[204] By losing the territory of Bangalore he undid the work of Shahaji in Karnataka. The loss of Bangalore "paved the way for the disappearance of the Maratha influence in

---

201. Ibid., p.109.
202. Ibid., Pp.108-112; Srinivasan, C.K. Maratha Rule in the Carnatak, p.177, F.N. 1.
203. Muddachari, B., Mysore-Maratha Relations, p.112.
204. Ibid., p.113.

Mysore".[205] Though Hirji Mahadik, the Maratha Subhedar of Jinji, tried to conquer Bangalore by military activity, he was not able to pursue that attempt as he was required to call back his troops when Jinji was attacked by Kasimkhan in 1687.[206]

Mughal Advance in 1687.

Mangalvedhe

When the Marathas had gone for the help of Bijapur, some Maratha officers were appointed on its forts by Sambhaji. In 1687, Manakoji, the commander of Sambhaji was acting as the commandent of the fort of Sangola. When the Mughals attacked that fort, Manakoji fought against them. But he was captured by the Mughals in that battle. The Mughals then sent him to Aurangzeb after they captured fort in May, 1687. After that, Aurangzeb gave him the robe of honour and appointed him as a Mansabadar of 2000 Jat and 1000 Swar.[207]

South India

In April, 1687, Prince Azzam conquered the fort of Belgaum and reported about it to Aurangzeb. Therefore, on 17th April, 1687, Aurangzeb ordered Aka Alikhan, the Daroga of artillery, to look after that fort till the time a commandant was appointed for that fort.[208] It was decided

---

205. Ibid.
206. Ibid., p.114.
207. Massir-i-Alamgiri-Pagadi, Pp.33-34.
208. Pagadi-Mughal Darbarachi Batami Patre (BIAS,XI, No.44,p.39).

by Aurangzeb on 20th April, 1687, that the fort of Belgaum be named as Azzam Nagar.[209]

Bagalana

When the Mughals could not succeed in conquering the Maratha fort of Salher by military measures, they resorted to the practices of bribery to capture that fort. For that Neknamkhan, the Mughal commandant of fort Mulher, sent some of his crafty men with valuable presents to Asoji, the Maratha commandant of the fort of Salher. Those persons persons succeeded in tempting Asoji by sweet talks and in making him hand over the fort of Salher to the Mughals in May, 1687.[210] After that, Asoji met Aurangzeb at Golkonda. Aurangzeb then gave a robe of honour, a standard, a tugh, kettle drums, a horse, an elephant and twenty thousand rupees to Asoji.[211]

Neknamkhan also succeeded in seducing the Maratha commandant of the fort of Ramsej and brought it under the Mughals.[212]

Desertions to the Mughals from the Svarajya - 1684 to September, 1687

When Chhatrapati Sambhaji was resolutely putting forth efforts to defend the Svarajya from the attacks of the Mughal

---

209. Ibid.
210. Futuhate Alamgiri-Pagadi, Pp.23-24. In the source the name of the Maratha commandant is given as Krishnaji. It does not seem to be correct as his name is given as Asoji in the Mughal Akhabar (Mughal Darbarachi Batami Patre, BIAS,XI, No.44,p.41).
211. Massir-i-Alamgiri-Pagadi,Pp.24-25; Khafikhan-Pagadi,p.11.
212. Khafikhan-Pagadi,p.11.

armies, some of the Marathas deserted the Svarajya and joined Aurangzeb.

In January, 1684, it was reported to Aurangzeb by Umadatulmulk Khan Jahan Bahadur that many Marathas were coming to see him from the Svarajya[213] (in order to decide about their desertion to the Mughals). In that month, Gaziuddinkhan also reported to Aurangzeb that according to the Kaul he had given, the servants of Sambhaji like Subhanji and others had agreed to desert the Svarajya and join the Mughals. Therefore, Gaziuddinkhan had promised a Mansab of 1000 Jat and 500 Swar to Subhanji, and 500 Jat and 200 Swar to Devaji. He requested Aurangzeb to sanction those Mansabs.[214]

It seems that Shaikh Muhammad Qureshi had deserted the Svarajya and joined the Mughals. On 15th May, 1684, Aurangzeb gave him Rs.1000/- as the condition of his life was not good.[215]

In August, 1684, Parsha, the servant of Sambhaji, who had deserted the Svarajya, was given a Mansab of 1500 Jat and 1000 Swar by Aurangzeb on the basis of the recommendations of Prince Azzam to that effect.[216] As a result of the Kaul given by Raadandazkhan, Bhadroji, servant of Sambhaji, joined the Mughals. Similarly, due to the efforts of Kazi

---

213. Farsi Sahitya Khanda Vi, No.470, p.302.
214. Ibid., No.475, p.306.
215. Ibid., No.482, p.313.
216. Ibid., No.491, p.318.

Haider, Khandoji and others left the Svarajya and went to the Mughal side. On 24th September, 1684, Aurangzeb pardoned Hirananda, Shankaraji and Padashah , who were from the Svarajya.[217] It seems that they had gone over to Aurangzeb after deserting the Svarajya earlier. It was reported in the same month that some servants of Sambhaji had come to Gaziuddinkhan with a hope to find service. It was further reported that the 5000 troops of Sambhaji, who had agreed to come to Gaziuddinkhan, will be sent to Aurangzeb.[218] On 9th October, 1684, Asaji and three other servants of Sambhaji went over to Aurangzeb for service.[219] It seems that Mashadrao, Maloji, Bankaji, Bahamani, and Anoji the servants of Sambhaji, had gone to Amanullah in order to join the Mughals. Aurangzeb gave them new Mansabs when Amanullah sent them to him.[220]

In October, 1684, Adhalrao, the commander of Sambhaji, to whom Sambhaji had sent in the Mughal territory of Shivner to collect Chauth, went to Muhammad Khalil, the Mughal Thanedar of Shivaner, with a hope to secure employment under the Mughals. When that was reported to Aurangzeb he asked Muhammad Khalil to send Adhalrao to him.[221]

It seems that Trimbakji Valad Lakhmoji had left the Svarajya and had joined Aurangzeb. Aurangzeb gave him

---

217. Ibid., No.492, p.319.
218. Ibid., No.494, Pp.320-321.
219. Ibid., No.498, p.322.
220. Ibid., No.504, p.325.
221. Ibid., no.505, p.326.

new promotion on 6th January, 1685.[222] On 12th January, some servants of Sambhaji, who were connected with the fort of Kothala (Miftahulfutuh) came to Aurangzeb through Gaziuddinkhan. Out of them Ramaji and Govindrao were given a Khilat and a horse by Aurangzeb.[223] In the same month Babaji and Parsaji seem to have gone over to the Mughal with their troops.[224] The other persons who went over to the Mughals by deserting the Svarajya in January, 1685, were Dhanaji, Kishanrao, Bhagwantrao, Mevaji, Rangaji,[225] Malik Beg, and Shaikh Beg.[226] Ramaji and Govindji, the commanders of Sambhaji, who had joined the Mughals, were given a Mansab of 500 Jat and 200 Swar by Aurangzeb on 31st January, 1685.[227]

In February, 1685, Sambhaji's servant, Govindrao went over to the Mughals. He was given a Mansab of 300 Jat and 100 Swar by Aurangzeb.[228] In that month, Rajaji, a Jamadar of 400 infantry troops of Sambhaji, joined the Mughals along with his relatives.[229]

In March, 1685, Muhammad Abid Valad Muhammad Akbar left the service of Sambhaji and saw Aurangzeb with a hope to secure employment in the Mughal service.[230] Aurangzeb

---

222. Ibid., No.541, p.350.
223. Ibid., No.545, p.352.
224. Ibid.
225. Ibid., No.554, p.361.
226. Ibid., No.558, p.364.
227. Ibid., No.560, p.366.
228. Ibid., No.562, p.368; No.570, p.375.
229. Ibid., No.569, p.373.
230. Ibid., No.577, Pp.379-380.

also rewarded Baji, Narasoji and Raghoji, the servants of Sambhaji, who had deserted the Svarajya, on 21st March, 1685,[231] and gave a Mansab of 400 Jat and 200 Swar to Dondaji on 22nd March, 1685.[232]

It seems that many soldiers of Sambhaji had deserted the Svarajya in order to join the Mughal service in April, 1685. This is clear from the Mughal Akhabar of 2nd April, which relates that Aurangzeb had asked Husamuddin, the Diwan of the army of Ruhullahkhan, that 2000 soldiers should be newly appointed in the government service as the servants of Sambhaji are coming to join it.[233]

Most of the above recorded desertions to the Mughals seem to have taken place as Sambhaji seems to have become unable to pay his troops properly because of the financial stress the Svarajya had experienced upto that time due to its war against the Mughals. This is clear from the Mughal Akhabar of 23rd October, 1684, in which it is reported by Kazi Haider to Aurangzeb that since Malik Beg Valad Lal Beg and Shaikh Hussein, who were appointed by Sambhaji in his service on the payment of 1000 Hons every year were given only 500 Hons by Sambhaji ; it was that they were coming to join the Mughal service.[234] After that when Aurangzeb asked them to join his service, they seem to have joined it in January, 1685.[235]

---

231. Ibid., No.585, p.386.
232. Ibid., No.587, p.387.
233. Ibid., No.594, p.390.
234. Ibid., No.505, p.326.
235. Ibid., No.558, p.364.

The other desertions seem to have taken place because of the advance made by the Mughals in the different areas of the Svarajya. The prominent example of such desertions was that of Sarjerao and Shivaji Jedhe who left the Svarajya and joined Aurangzeb in October, 1685.[236]

Chhatrapati Sambhaji, got enraged when he learnt about the desertion of Sarjerao Jedhe. Therefore, he wrote a letter on 5th October, 1685, to him. That letter expresses his fury against the treacherous conduct of Sarjerao.[237]

The desertions of the Marathas from the Svarajya to the Mughals was also due to the Mansabdari policy which Aurangzeb pursued in the Deccan to annihilate the Svarajya. By that Aurangzeb granted Mansabs high enough to induce them to betray their own state.[238] He also pursued a policy of confirming old Vatans in Maharashtra to the Maratha Vatandars like the Deshmukhs, Deshpandes, and others.[239]

As a result of that policy, it seems that Kanhoji Dakhani (Shirke), who was a Vatandar in the Svarajya, left Sambhaji and joined the Mughal service on 17th June, 1684.[240]

In 1684, when Shah Alam invaded the Konkan area of the Svarajya, Khem Sawant of Kudal rendered him help against the Svarajya. Similarly, he also helped the Portuguese when Sambhaji was at war with them. When Sambhaji tried to

---

236. SCS Khanda II, p.234.
237. Sambhaji Kalin Patrasara Samgraha, No.162, Pp.53-54.
238. Athar Ali, M., The Mughal Nobility Under Aurangzeb, p.11; 13-14; 30.
239. Sardesai-Peshwa Daftar XXXI, Pp.42-45; Sardesai-Rajaram, p.52; Bendre-Sambhaji, p.593.
240. Massir-i-Alamgiri-Pagadi, p.23.

punish him, he was given shelter by the Portuguese in the territory of Goa. Seeing that he had taken a stand against Sambhaji, Kanhoji Raje Prabhanvalikar (Kanhoji Dakhani), who was already in the Mughal service, sent him a letter to convey his satisfaction about his opposition to the Svarajya.[241] It seems that Mahadaji Naik (Nimbalkar), who was already in the Mughal service, arranged for the desertion of Khem Sawant of Kudal in the service of Aurangzeb in September, 1686.[242] It appears that persons like Mahadaji Naik (Nimbalkar) strongly believed after the conquest of the Kingdom of Bijapur by Aurangzeb on 12th September, 1686, that after the conquest of the Kingdom of Golkonda, Aurangzeb will shortly and easily over power the Svarajya.[243]

It seems that due to the various considerations stated above it was that Padaji, Ekoji, Malhararao, and Sujanchand entered in the service of Aurangzeb.[244] On 1st May, 1685, Arjunji, the son of Chhatrapati Sambhaji's uncle, went over to the Mughals probably for the same reasons. He was given a Mansab by Aurangzeb.[245] Aurangzeb also gave a Mansab to Achaloji (brother of Hirji Mahadik) when he joined the Mughals on 31st January, 1686.[246] Asoji, the commandant of the Maratha fort of Salher, handed over that fort to the Mughals and entered in the Mughal service

---

241. BISMQ XL-XLI, Nos.1-8, No.107, p.123.
242. Ibid., No.8, p.13.
243. Ibid.
244. Massir-i-Alamgiri-Pagadi, p.28.
245. Ibid., p.30.
246. Ibid., p.32.

on 27th May, 1687, in order to secure a Mansab and other rewards from Aurangzeb.[247] Manakoji, the commandant of the Maratha fort of Sangola, also joined the Mughal service on 29th May, 1687, and secured a Mansab from Aurangzeb.[248] The Maratha commandant of fort Ramsej also handed over, that fort to Nekuamkhan, the Mughal commandant of the fort of Mulher in Bagalana[249] by falling a prey to the Mughal practices of bribery.

The confidence of the Maratha Vatandars like the Deshmukhs and the Deshpandes was shaken when Shiabuddinkhan, the Mughal commander, occupied Poona in 1683. Therefore, to save their Vatans, many of them went over to the Mughal side and got their Vatans confirmed by Aurangzeb.[250]

In that circumstance, Chhatrapati Sambhaji,[251] Kavi Kalash,[252] and Shankaraji Narayan Sachiv,[253] tried to assure the Maratha Vatandars about the military strength of the Svarajya. In spite of that, many persons, who were in the service of Sambhaji, and many Maratha Vatandars of the Svarajya, deserted to the Mughals. That resulted in reducing the strength of the Svarajya.

In that atmosphere, in January-February, 1685, Khem Sawant, the Desai of Kudal, revolted against Sambhaji and

---

247. Ibid., p.34.
248. Ibid.
249. Khafikhan-Pagadi, p.11.
250. Bendre-Sambhaji, p.260.
251. Sambhaji Kalin Patrasar Samgraha, No.162, Pp.53-54.
252. Ibid., No.126, Pp.39-40.
253. Ibid., No.184, p.61.

went over to the Portuguese, who were the enemies of the Svarajya.[254] With the help of the Portuguese, he looted and burnt the Maratha territory which was near Goa. Ram Dalvi, and the Desais of Kudal, Sonda, and Kadra also rose in rebellion against Sambhaji. As they looted and burnt the territory of the Svarajya, the Maratha subjects who were near the border of Karwar and Goa, were put in great difficulties.[255]

The period, September, 1683, to 21st September, 1687, was of the second phase of the war of Sambhaji against Aurangzeb.

In that phase, Aurangzeb reduced the Kingdoms of Bijapur and Golkonda which were in alliance with Sambhaji. By that Aurangzeb became able to concentrate all his military resources against Sambhaji in order to achieve decisive results.

Aurangzeb also succeeded in securing the Maratha forts of Salher, Kanera, and Ramsej of the Bagalana territory by resorting to the measures of bribery when the Mughal forces had become unable to conquer those by assaults. Aurangzeb's measures of bribery could be successful in the Bagalana because it was a territory which was conquered by Shivaji, and it was not a territory of the Svarajya proper.

---

254. Jedhe Shakavali, p.33.
255. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.308.

The people of the Svarajya did not fall a prey to the practices of bribery employed by Aurangzeb. Therefore, except the Maratha fort of Kothala, which the Mughals had brought under them by deceit, the other forts were ably defended by the Marathas.

The Mughal armies had penetrated in the territory of Poona, Satara and the Tal-Konkan. But the Marathas were exerting to expel them from those territories.

The Marathas carried out successfully their aim of looting and disturbing the Mughal territories of Osmanabad, Aurangabad, Bhir, Ahmednagar, Nasik, Junnar and Berar. Aurangzeb was required to send his troops constantly in order to save those areas from the Maratha attack.

But the war of Sambhaji against Aurangzeb seems to have produced adverse effects on the finances of the Svarajya. Due to that Sambhaji could not pay properly to his officers and the troops. Therefore, some of them deserted to the Mughals. That resulted in causing a decline in the military strength of the Svarajya. In spite of that Chhatrapati Sambhaji continued his war against Aurangzeb.

Chapter VIII

SAMBHAJI'S WAR WITH THE MUGHALS

(22nd September, 1687 To 11th March, 1689)

Maratha Activity - September to December, 1687

Though Aurangzeb had conquered the Kingdoms of Bijapur and Golkonda, the Marathas had not ceased to fight vigourously against the Mughals and they attacked the territory of Bijapur which was now under the Mughals. This is evident from the news which had come to Aurangzeb from Bijapur and which said that " Rahimdad, the general of Sambhaji had arrived with considerable troops in the territory of Panchamgad and had conquered that territory. Therefore, the Mughal officers, Ihteshamkhan and Naroji Ragho marched against him. Then a severe fighting took place between the Marathas and the Mughals. In it two thousand persons from both the armies were killed. At last, the Mughals captured Rahimdad as a prisoner."[1]

After the conquest of the Kingdom of Bijapur, Aurangzeb had sent Sarjakhan, a general of Bijapur who had joined the Mughal service, against the Marathas. Sarjakhan then penetrated in the territory of the Svarajya upto Wai. He was attacked there by Hambirrao Mohite, the Commander-in-Chief of Chhatrapati Sambhaji. In the fierce battle which took place between them in December, 1687, though the Marathas won the victory, they lost Hambirrao, who was struck fatally by a canon-ball.[2]

---

1. Futuhate Alamgiri-Pagadi, p.25.
2. Sardesai-Sambhaji, p.85.

The death of Hambirrao Mohite was a great loss to the Svarajya. By fighting successfully against the Mughal armies in the areas of Kalyan, Bhiwandi, and Panhala, he had checked their penetration in the Svarajya.

Mughal Activity - 1688

Bijapur Province and South India

After the conquest of the Kingdoms of Bijapur and Golkonda, Aurangzeb determined to conquer the Svarajya. For that he decided to stay at Bijapur and direct from there the military activity of his troops. Therefore, he left Hyderabad (Deccan) on 25th January, 1688, for Bijapur. He reached Bijapur on 15th March, 1688.[3]

Meanwhile Aurangzeb deputed Prince Azzam with 40000 troops against Sambhaji. Prince Azzam then conquered the fort of Belgaum, which was in the territory of the Bijapur province. After that the fort of Belgaum was renamed as Azzamnagar. Prince Azzam then returned to Bijapur.[4]

On 25th January, 1688, Aurangzeb sent Gaziuddinkhan and other nobles to conquer the fort of Adhoni. On his way to Adhoni, Gaziuddinkhan conquered the forts which were in the Bijapur province. Out of them Himmatgad was renamed as Firozgad.[5] After that Gaziuddinkhan laid siege to the fort of Adhoni of the former Kingdom of Bijapur and

---

3. Massir-i-Alamgiri-Pagadi, Pp.34-35.
4. Ibid.
5. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha-Pagadi, p.97.

which was held by Siddi Masud. Siddi Masud then surrendered that fort to the Mughals on 8th August, 1688. The Mughals renamed that fort as Imatiyajgad. Siddi Masud along with his relatives entered in the service of Aurangzeb. He was given a Mansab of seven thousand by Aurangzeb. His relatives were also given the Mansabs of 4000 and 5000 along with the title Khan by Aurangzeb.[6]

Bagalana

Aurangzeb had appointed the Mughal officer, Matabarkhan to reduce the Maratha forts in Bagalana. Matabarkhan was given the charge of the districts of Nasik, Sangamner above the ghats and Kalyan, Bhiwandi in the Konkan region.

In order to become successful in his undertaking, Matabarkhan employed 1000 infantry of Kolis, Bhils and Mavlas in Bagalana. He paid considerable money to the land holder of the region adjacent to the fort Patta, which was in Bagalana. He also gave considerable amount, a horse, and a robe of honour to Harji Jakhade, who was staying in the village of Sona in the Pargana of Sinnar. Harji Jakhade then took his troops to the fort Patta on 11th January, 1688. On the 17th January, 1688, at midnight those troops scaled the fort walls by means of ropes and captured that fort. In that campaign Matabarkhan spent Rs.45000.[7]

---

6. Ibid., p.98.
7. Letters of Matabarkhan-Pagadi, Pp.20-21.

Matabarkhan, then strove to capture the Maratha forts of Karang (Kulang, 9 miles from Igatpuri), Babhar, Tabaka, and Rohatgad. The fort of Karang was unrivalled in its situation and strength. The Marathas had constructed high buildings in that fort. In order to conquer it, Matabarkhan employed numerous force of Kolis, Bhils, and Mavlas. He then sent them to take up positions in ravines and valleys and to seize the opportunity to capture that fort. As that fort was excavated from the rock to a height of four to five hundred yards, he found it difficult to lay siege to it and capture it through the scaling of its walls. He, therefore, made inquiries about the homes of the garrison. He found out that the women and children of the garrison were at the foot of the fort of Parbal, also known as Muranjan, in the district of Tal-Konkan. He then sent 1000 infantry troops to capture the women and children. That infantry then attacked the homes of the garrison in the night and capturing a number of women and children brought them to Gulshanabad (Nasik). In that atmosphere of confusion, the troops which Matabarkhan had posted in the valleys and ravines of the fort, seized an opportunity to scale the walls of some of the forts. They killed many soldiers from the garrison and threw many of them from the forts into the valleys below. When the garrison saw that their women and children had been captured, they surrendered those forts to Matabarkhan.[8]

---

8. Ibid., p.22.

After that Matabarkhan laid siege to the Maratha forts of Aundh, Kawani, Haris (Harishgad, 4 miles from Trimbakeshwar), Tringalwadi, Madangad, and Mordant, and captured them by the end of 1688.[9]

Asoji, the Mughal Thanedar of Gulshanabad (Nasik) conquered Markandagad (12 miles to the south-west of Kalwan in the hills of Nasik) in Bagalana from the Marathas in April, 1688.[10]

In August, 1688, the Mughal general, Abdullakhan attacked and captured Holgad from the Marathas.[11]

By the end of 1688, the Mughal general, Matabarkhan also laid siege to the fort of Trimbakeshwar, the only remaining Maratha fort in Bagalana. By that the Mughals were now in a position to penetrate in the Konkan. Therefore, to watch their movements, Sambhaji posted Peshwa Nilakantha Moreshwar at Rajmachi.[12]

Mughal Advance in the Svarajya - 1688

In April, 1688, Vikram Patangrao, the ruler of Jawhar, conquered the Maratha fort of Kohoj (in the hills of Thana, 10 miles to the west of Wada) for the Mughals.[13]

By August, 1688, the Mughals advanced in the territory

---

9. Pagadi-Maratha Mughal Relations, p.49.
10. Pagadi,S.-Mughal Darbarachi Batamipatre,(BIAS XI, No.44,p.39).
11. Ibid., p.40.
12. Pagadi-Maratha-Mughal Relations, p.49.
13. Pagadi,S.-Mughal Darbarachi Batamipatre,(BIAS XI, No.44, p.39).

of the Svarajya and conquered Sarasgad (i.e. Pali, in the hills of Kulaba near Pali in the territory of Bhor) from the Marathas. This is proved by the fact that on 7th August, 1688, Aurangzeb appointed Sayyad Abdullakhan as the commandant of Sarasgad.[14]

On 7th August, 1688, Aurangzeb deputed Multafatkhan to conquer the territories of Sambhaji. He also sent Bakhtvalkhan, Fajulla, the nephew of Multafatkhan, and Nagoji, a mansabdar of 5000, with Multafatkhan in order to carry out that task.[15]

In September, 1688, the Mughal general, Bahadurkhan succeeded in conquering Samangad (3½ miles to the south of Gadhinglaj in the hills of Kolhapur) from the Marathas.[16]

It was reported to Aurangzeb on 29th September, 1688, by Multafatkhan that he (Multafatkhan) marched from Khatav to a distance of 8 Kos in the territory of the Svarajya. Then he caused destruction of the territory which was at the foot of Narogad (i.e. Prachitgad (?) near Shringarpur in the hills of Ratnagiri). After that he was attacked by the Maratha commandant of Narogad. In that battle, the Mughal army killed 200 Maratha troops and captured their animals.[17]

The advance effected by the Mughal armies in the Svarajya in 1688, affected adversely the morale of the

---

14. Ibid., p.40.
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid.
17. Ibid., Pp.40-41.

Maratha Vatandars and the Maratha commandants in the territory of Konkan. This is proved by the letter which Abdul Kadar (who laterwards became famous as Matabarkhan), the Mughal Thanedar of Kedal (?), wrote to Aurangzeb. He reported in it that "the Vatandars of Konkan had come to see me in the last quarter of August, 1688. Sambhaji's commandant of the fort of Mahuli (4 miles to the north-west of Shahapur in the hills of Thana) also started a talk of handing over that fort to the Mughals and of joining the Mughal service if he will be given a Mansab like the one which was given to Asoji, the Maratha commandant of the fort of Salher; and rupees forty thousand together with ten horses, ten robes of Khilat and Vatan of two villages (near Junnar ?)". Aurangzeb then agreed to give those things to the commandant of the fort of Mahuli and ordered Abdul Kadar to send that commandant to see him.[18]

In January, 1688, Shaikh Nizam (the general of Golkonda, who had deserted to the Mughals on 28th May, 1687, and who was given a Mansab of 6000 and title Mukarrabkhan by Aurangzeb), was posted in the Panhala region of the Svarajya against Sambhaji by Aurangzeb.[19] After reaching Kolhapur, Mukarrabkhan spread his spies in that region in order to secure the news of the movements of Sambhaji.[20]

---

18. Ibid., p.41.
19. Khafikhan-Pagadi, p.15; Pagadi-Maratha Mughal Relations, p.49.
20. Massir-i-Alamgiri-Pagadi, p.37.

It has been noted earlier as to how the Maratha Vatandars flittered with the Mughals in order to preserve their Vatans. Like the Jedhes it was now the turn of the Shirkes to turn against Sambhaji. As the Mughal pressure increased in the Kolhapur region, the Shirkes, who were the relations of Sambhaji from the side of his queen, Yesubai, rose in revolt against Sambhaji, as they were worried like the other Maratha Vatandars about the continuation of their Vatans by the Mughals if the Mughals became victorious against Sambhaji. The Shirkes then attacked and defeated Kavi Kalash, who was probably having under him the administration of the Subha of Panhala or Prabhavali at that time.[21] As a result, Kavi Kalash fled to fort Khelana (also known as Vishalgad, 45 miles to the north-west of Rajapur in the hills of Kolhapur).[22] That made Sambhaji to go for the help of Kavi Kalash from Raigad. After that Sambhaji fought against the Shirkes and defeated them. When they fled (from that territory), he went to fort Khelana. Sambhaji had caused much destruction in the territory of the Shirkes.[23] All these things took place sometime during 15th October and 12th November, 1688.[24]

When Sambhaji was busy in putting down the revolt of the Shirkes, it appears that Mukarrabkhan, who was posted

---

21. Bendre-Sambhaji, p.595.
22. Jedhe Shakavali, p.34.
23. Sambhaji Kalin Patrasar Samgraha, No.290,p.96.
24. Jedhe Shakavali, p.34.

by Aurangzeb in the Panhala region [redacted] tried to bring the Maratha fort of Panhala under the Mughals by employing practices of bribery. Some of the Marathas who were in that fort then became ready to hand over that fort and prince Rajaram who was in it to the Mughals. But as Sambhaji got an inkling of their treacherous activity, he marched to Panhala and put down those conspirators.[25] He then put under arrest Pralhad Niraji and some of the Sarkarkuns and other persons who were in that fort because of the advice given to him by Kavi Kalash. These matters took place sometime during 13th November, 1688, and 12th December, 1688.[26]

When Sambhaji was busy in establishing his control on Panhala Aurangzeb despatched Itikatkhan (later Zulfikarkhan) in December, 1688, to conquer Raigad from the Marathas.[27]

Sambhaji's Relations with the English - 1688-1689

During 1688-1689, the English continued to remain in friendship with Sambhaji till the time he was captured by the Mughals in February, 1689.

Sambhaji's War with the Mughals - (Fall of Golkonda 21st September, 1687, to 11th March, 1689)

Sambhaji and the Portuguese - 1688-1689

Khem Sawant, Ram Dalvi, Dulba Naik, and other Desais of the Konkan, who had joined the Portuguese against Sambhaji,

---

25. Bendre-Sambhaji, p.596.
26. Jedhe Shakavali, p.34.
27. Massir-i-Alamgiri-Pagadi, p.45; Pagadi-Hindavi Svarajya Ani Mogal, p.90.

were allowed to enter in the Mughal service by the Portuguese in August, 1688.[28] They as well as the Portuguese continued their war against Sambhaji till the time he was captured alive by the Mughals in February, 1689.

Maratha Affairs in Karnataka - 1688 to 1689

During 1687 and 1688, as Sambhaji was busy in the Svarajya in defending himself against Aurangzeb, he did not do anything in particular to serve the interests of the Svarajya in Karnataka. Owing to the Mughal trouble in Karnataka, Hirji Mahadik also could not do anything effective to arrest the progress of the Mysore in Karnataka. That afforded an opportunity to Chikkadeva Raja to conquer the Maratha territories of Hoskot, Manugonde durga, Mannargudi and Dharmapuri during November, 1688 and January, 1689.[29] Due to that the hold of the Svarajya decreased in South India.

Capture of Sambhaji by the Mughals (1st February, 1689)

The extant sources do not give much information about the whereabouts and the activity of Chhatrapati Sambhaji in the month of January, 1689.

It appears that in January, 1689, Sambhaji was in the region of fort Panhala and Khelana. He seems to have left fort Khelana in that month in order to go to Raigad as Itikadkhan (Zulfikarkhan), the Mughal general, whom

---

28. Pissurlenkar-Portugej-Marathe Sambandha, p.128.
29. Muddachari-Mysore-Maratha Relations, p.116.

Aurangzeb had deputed to conquer Raigad, was marching towards it with his troops.[30]

On his way to Raigad, Sambhaji went along with Kavi Kalash to Sangameshwar.[31] They stayed at that place in the spacious building of the Sardesai family.[32] At that place Sambhaji was attacked and captured alive by Mukarrabkhan on 1st February, 1689.[33]

Since the capture of Sambhaji by the Mughals proved to be a turning point in the history of both, the Svarajya and the Mughal empire, the dramatic circumstances under which Sambhaji was captured have engaged the mind of the historians upto now.

The account of the capture of Sambhaji by the Mughals has been given by Muhammad Saqi Mustaidkhan in his work Massir-i-Alamgiri. He was present in the Mughal camp when Sambhaji was brought before Aurangzeb. "In compiling his work, Saki Mustaidkhan drew upon official reports in addition to his own observation of the events".[34] He has stated in his work that "Shaikh Nizam alias Mukarrabkhan, a brave general, who with his sons and relatives enjoyed among themselves the rank of 25 Hazari in recognition of his military capacity had been appointed from Bijapur, by Aurangzeb to capture the Maratha fortress of Panhala.

---

30. Futuhate Alamgiri-Pagadi, p.33; Pagadi-Hindavi Svarajya Ani Mogal, p.91.
31. Sambhaji Shakavali, p.119.
32. Sardesai-Sambhaji, Pp.96-97; p.97, F.N.1.
33. Sambhaji Shakavali, p.119.
34. Pagadi-Maratha Mughal Relations, p.51.

He had sent spies to bring the news about Sambhaji. Suddenly those spies brought to him the news that "a quarrel had broken out between Sambhaji and his relatives, the members of the Shirke family. He had gone from Raigad to fort Khelana (Vishalgad). He had resolved the dispute and after satisfactorily arranging for the provisions in that fort, he had gone to Sangameshwar. His evil minister, Kavi Kalash has constructed buildings and gardens at that place. There, Sambhaji is immersed in pleasure." Mukarrabkhan then marched from Kolhapur. Sangameshwar was at a distance of forty five Kos from Kolhapur. The path and the passages were difficult. No traveller in the world could have seen the like of them. But Mukarrabkhan in utter disregard for his life, collected a band of devout and brave followers and made a rapid march. Sambhaji's news reporters informed him in various ways that the Mughal army was approaching. But Sambhaji was intoxicated with pride and folly. He had them beheaded by giving the signal of a frown, saying "you heedless men! you are mad. Can a Mughal force arrive here"? The Khan, after patiently enduring much fatigue, suddenly came upon Sambhaji with the speed of lightening and wind. That wretch, Sambhaji, charged with a force of four to five thousand Maratha spearmen. As luck would have it, an arrow hit Kavi Kalash. After a short fight, Sambhaji fled. Sambhaji then hid himself in a hole, namely, the mansion of

Kavi Kalash.* He thought that nobody had seen him. The messengers made inquiries and informed the Khan that Sambhaji was hiding in the mansion. Mukarrabkhan did not pursue the Marathas who were fleeing. Instead, he surrounded the mansion. Ikhlaskhan, the son of Mukarrabkhan entered that mansion through a stair. He was accompanied by brave colleagues. He dragged Sambhaji by the hair and brought him to the feet of the elephant of Mukarrabkhan."[35]

Khafikhan, who was not present in the camp of Aurangzeb during the time of that episode, has given its account on the basis of the matters related to him by his friends, who were present in that camp. His account, while giving the information of that episode, which is given by Saki Mustaidkhan, tells about the diversions of Sambhaji with wine and women at Sangameshwar. Khafikhan has stated that after the fight, Sambhaji hid himself in a temple. When the Mughals came to capture him, he had shaved his hair and had put on the disguise of a mendicant. But the Mughals recognized him because of a pearl necklace which he had worn around his neck.[36]

Bhimsen Saxena, the author of the Tarikh-i-Dilkusha, who was present in the Mughal camp when Sambhaji was brought before Aurangzeb has given the following account of the capture of Sambhaji. He has stated that "Khanzaman

*It was the mansion of the Sardesai family. See Sardesai-Sambhaji, Pp.96-97.
35. Massir-i-Alamgiri-Pagadi, Pp.36-38.
36. Khafikhan-Pagadi, Pp.15-18.

(Mukarrabkhan) received the following news from his spies;- "Sambhaji is residing in the fort of Khelana (Vishalgad), which is situated in the passes leading to the Konkan, and which is at a distance of fifteen Kos from the fort of Panhala. He is utterly negligent and is heavily indulging in drink. He is intoxicated and utterly oblivious of anything else. As soon as Mukarrabkhan heard this news, he marched against Sambhaji. Mukarrabkhan fell upon him early in the morning. Sambhaji had decided to leave for Raigad. Therefore, he had sent away his troops and his dependents in advance. He himself stayed on waiting for Kavi Kalash. Sambhaji looked upon Kavi Kalash as his Guru (Preceptor). Kavi Kalash was at that time engaged in performing worship. Suddenly both of them found themselves captured by the Mughals. Mukarrabkhan immediately wrote an account of the capture of Sambhaji to Aurangzeb."[37]

Ishwardas Nagar[38] and Manucci[39] have stated that Kavi Kalash, who was a traitor and in league with the Mughals, managed to get captured Sambhaji at the hands of Mukarrabkhan. But their version is not borne out by other Persian and Marathi sources.

Amongst the Marathi sources, we get the account of the capture of Sambhaji by the Mughals only in the

---

37. Tarikh-i-Dilkusha-Pagadi, Pp.98-99.
38. Futuhate Alamgiri-Pagadi, Pp.29-30.
39. Storia-Do-Mogor II, p.291.

Bakhar of Sambhaji and Rajaram. It is written by Malharrao Chitnis in 1811 A.D. He has stated that "Aurangzeb came to know that Kavi Kalash has kept Sambhaji under his influence and that Sambhaji has become an addict to wine... when Aurangzeb was deciding to march against Sambhaji, Ilachi Beg (Mukarrabkhan) showed his readiness to proceed against Sambhaji. Mukarrabkhan then took (about) one or two thousand soldiers and proceeded against Sambhaji. About five thousand troops were to join him later. When Sambhaji was told about the coming of the Mughal army (by the spies), he told that the matter be reported to Kavi Kalash. (After learning that news) Kavi Kalash said "What that army is going to do ? I will start (the religious) experiment of a charm (Prayoga) and destroy that army in a moment." On that the Maratha ministers and nobles showed their readiness to face that Mughal army and requested his orders for that. But Sambhaji told them to refer that matter to Kavi Kalash and to follow what he will tell them to do. After that though the ministers and the nobles wanted to see Sambhaji and urge upon him to take effective measures (against the Mughal army), they were not allowed to see him. Due to that some ministers and nobles went away from that place. Out of them some went to Raigad. (When that was taking place) Mukarrabkhan descended the Ghat of Vishalgad (Khelana) with one thousand troops. Its news was given to Sambhaji. But Sambhaji was bereft of consciousness. He had also not made any arrangement to

face the Mughal army. Mukarrabkhan then pretended that he had come to have negotiations (Vakili) with Sambhaji and by sending letters to that effect to Sambhaji, galloped with his troops to Sangameshwar. When the persons around Sambhaji told him (Sambhaji) that the Mughal army and Mukarrabkhan had come, Sambhaji said 'where is Kavi Kalash ? Call him, and finding out as to why Mukarrabkhan had come, ask him (Kavi Kalash) to go to visit him'. While talking like this Sambhaji himself came near the door (of the house). Then Mukarrabkhan captured him. The Marathas, who tried to oppose him, were killed by the Mughals.[40]

Taking into account the version of the capture of Sambhaji by Mukarrabkhan, given by the different sources following facts emerge. The Mughals were keenly watching the movements of Sambhaji since 1688. In that year Mughal advance took place in the territory of Kolhapur of the Svarajya. Therefore, the members of the Shirke family, who were the relatives of Sambhaji from his wife's (Yesubai's) side, revolted against him. Sambhaji then proceeded from Raigad and put down their revolt. Then he stamped out the seditious activities of some of his officers who had become ready to hand over the fort of Panhala to the Mughals. After that Sambhaji moved to fort Khelana (Vishalgad) for sometime. He took the necessary care to

---

40. Sambhaji and Rajaram Bakhar-Chitnis-Sane, Pp.29-32.

see that the fort was well provisioned and put in a state of defence. Then on his way back to Raigad, he halted at Sangameshwar. He did not expect a Mughal advance from Kolhapur to Sangameshwar. Therefore, he sent away the bulk of his army to Raigad. On the night of the day previous to his capture by the Mughals, Sambhaji seems to have diverted himself with wine and women. On getting that news, Mukarrabkhan marched in that night from Kolhapur towards Sangameshwar. When the news of the approach of the Mughal army was given to him by the messengers, Sambhaji seems to have not believed in it. As he did not take measures to oppose Mukarrabkhan, he and his army could reach without any obstruction to Sangameshwar in the morning when Sambhaji was to leave for Raigad. By that time Sambhaji was free from the influence of drink and he came out to fight the Mughals with his meagre resources. His followers fled when Kavi Kalash was wounded, and the general, Malhoji Ghorpade was killed.[41] Sambhaji then took refuge in the mansion of the Sardesai family, possibly in the room meant for worship, which Khafikhan supposed to be a temple. Then Sambhaji was surprised by Ikhlashkhan, the son of Mukarrabkhan.* After a brief resistance Ikhlaskhan overpowered and captured Sambhaji. Kavi Kalash,

---

41. Kavyetihas Sangraha - Lekh, etc.,No.435,Pp.384-385.

* In a document of 1771 A.D. it is stated that Sambhaji was captured by the Mughals at Navdi (Sardesai-Peshwa Daftar XXXIX, No.138,p.140; Sarkar-House of Shivaji,p.231,F.N.; Sardesai-Sambhaji,p.95), a village near Sangameshwar. This probably indicates that Sambhaji had not taken refuge in a temple but had escaped to that village(Gokhale-Sambhaji,p.469).

who was wounded in the fight, was already captured outside by the Mughals by that time.

Sambhaji's followers, the prominent among whom were Santaji Ghorpade, the son of Malhoji Ghorpade; and Khando Ballal Chitnis, escaped from Sangameshwar and made their way to Raigad.

The news of Sambhaji's capture spread like wild fire in the Svarajya. His capture by Aurangzeb proved to be a stunning blow for the people of the Svarajya, and due to that they became a paralysed people. As a result, Mukarrabkhan successfully carried Sambhaji and Kavi Kalash to Aurangzeb's camp. This is proved by the account which Saki Mustaidkhan has given about Mukarrabkhan's bringing Sambhaji to the Imperial camp. He has stated that "The victorious Khan (Mukarrabkhan) came out of the country (in safety) by prudent management and through the good luck of Alamgir. None of the infidel chiefs made any effort to rescue the prisoner (Sambhaji). On 15th February, 1689, when the imperial army, after marching from Akluj (Asadnagar) had camped at Bahadurgad, Sambhaji was brought to the court" before Aurangzeb.[42]

The capture of Sambhaji caused the wildest feeling of exultation among the Mughals. The author of the Massir-i-Alamgiri, Saki Mustaidkhan, who was present in the camp of

---

42. Massir-i-Alamgiri-Pagadi, p.38.

Aurangzeb at that time has stated that "The ears of the world were gladdened by a happy news from the invisible world. The merry music of victory, which the ears of the Muslim had been expecting, resounded through the sky. Peace and safety were restored through the blessings of justice and virtue of the Emperor. Disturbances sank down. Satan was chained. To speak more plainly, through the power of the Emperor's fortune, the infernal infidel, Sambha, was made prisoner by the army".[43]

On getting the news of the capture of Sambhaji, Aurangzeb ordered that Sambhaji should be made a mark of public redicule. As directed by Aurangzeb, four miles outside the Imperial Camp, Sambhaji and Kavi Kalash were dressed as buffoons with long fool's caps and bells placed on their heads, mounted on camels, and brought to Bahadurgad with drums beating and trumpets pealing. Hundreds of thousands of spectators lined the roads, to gaze at Sambhaji as at a new kind of wild beast or demon. Thus degraded, the captives were slowly paraded through the entire camp and finally brought to Emperor Aurangzeb who was sitting in full darbar for the occasion".[44]

Even though Sambhaji was put to all humiliations, he met his fate with great dignity. Ishwardas Nagar, who visited Aurangzeb's camp in 1696 heard about it from

---

43. Massir-i-Alamgiri-Pagadi, p.36; Pagadi-MarathaMughal Relations, p.55.
44. Ibid., Pp.38-39.

reliable persons. On its basis he has stated that "Sambhaji was brought before Aurangzeb. He was proud and haughty. Although reduced to a wretched condition, he did not bow his head before the Emperor. Ikhaskhan and Hamiduddinkhan tried their best to persuade him to make obeisance to the Emperor, but to no effect."[45]

Seeing that Sambhaji was brought as a captive in his court, " Aurangzeb descended from his throne and kneeling down on the carpet bowed his head to the ground in double thankfulness to the Giver of this crowning victory. After he had looked at Sambhaji and Kavi Kalash, the captives were removed to prison ".[46] " The same night, Sambhaji was blinded and the next day the tongue of Kavi Kalash was cut out. For, Sambhaji had previously ignored the value of imperial mercy and fled first from the Emperor's Court in the company of his father, and the second time from the late Dilerkhan".[47] However, about that punishment given to Sambhaji and Kavi Kalash, different versions have been given by Khafikhan and Ishwardas Nagar. According to Khafikhan, " Some well-wishers of Aurangzeb advised that the lives of Sambhaji and Kavi Kalash be spared. They should be persuaded to ask their officers to surrender their forts. Once the keys of the forts were delivered,

---

45. Futuhate Alamgiri-Pagadi, p.31.
46. Khafikhan-Pagadi, p.39.
47. Massir-i-Alamgiri-Pagadi, p.39.

UNIVERSITY OF BOMBAY LIBRARY

Sambhaji and Kavi Kalash be given life long imprisonment. But Sambhaji and Kavi Kalash realised that they would be ultimately beheaded. Even if they were kept in prison, they would have to bear the tortures of prison life and that life would not be pleasant. Every day in prison would mean death. With this realisation, they used abusive language against the Emperor. The Emperor then ordered that for using insulting language their tongues should be cut out. After that their eyes should be taken out."[48] According to Ishwardas Nagar as quoted by J. Sarkar,[49]" After two days, the Emperor ordered Ruhullahkhan (the Bakshi) as follows: "Go and inquire from Sambhaji about the whereabouts of his treasure and of the names of the Mughal officers who corresponded secretly with him." But once a man dispairs of his life, he begins to talk whatever occurs to his mind. Sambhaji was a proud and haughty person. He used abusive and insulting language against the Emperor and scurrilously asked for one of Aurangzeb's daughters to be given to him as the price of his friendship. Ruhullahkhan did not convey all that Sambhaji said to the Emperor. He gave a hint of what Sambhaji had said. On this the Emperor ordered that Sambhaji's eyes be taken out". According to Pagadi, S.[50] " Sir Jadunath has not quoted Ishwardas correctly." He has

---

48. Khafikhan-Pagadi, Pp.19-20.
49. Aurangzib IV, Pp.402-403.
50. Maratha-Mughal Relations, Pp.56-57.

pointed out that the matter which Sarkar,J., has quoted of Ishwardas that "Ruhullahkhan was sent by Aurangzeb to learn from Sambhaji where he kept his treasures hidden and which of the imperial officers used to correspond with him. Fretting with bitterness of soul on being publicly insulted and now driven to dispair, Sambhaji spurned at the offer of life, loosened his tongue in abuse of the Emperor and his Prophet, and scurrilously asked for one of Aurangzeb's daughter to be given to him as the price of friendship" is not found in Ishwardas' version. According to Pagadi,S., " Sambhaji could not have spurned at the offer of life. Aurangzeb was determined to kill him. He had no desire to spare Sambhaji's life. Sambhaji only abused the Emperor. He did not abuse the Prophet of Islam. Ishwardas has used the words Hazarat Zille Subhani for the Emperor. Sir Jadunath thought that Hazarat meant the Prophet and Zille Subhani, the Emperor. This is not so. Ishwardas says that Sambhaji scurrilously asked for one of Aurangzeb's daughter to be given to him as the price of friendship. Probably Sir Jadunath had some worthless Marathi Chronicles of a later date in mind.* But there is no reason to create

---

* That Sambhaji asked for one of Aurangzeb's daughter is stated in Sambhaji and Rajaram Bakhar-Chitnis-Sane, Pp.34-35. That matter, which has no foundations, seems to have passed in the later documents (for example, See - Sardesai, Kulkarni, and Kale, (Ed.), Aitihasik Patravyavahar, No.434, Pp.422-423). Due to that it seems that there developed a legend of the love of Zebunnisa, the daughter of Aurangzeb, with Sambhaji. That legend is without any foundations; See - Patwardhan, P.N., Sambhaji Va Zebunnisa, (Varshik Itivritta, Shake 1837, Pp.143-146).

an impression that the statement occurs in the narrative of Ishwardas. There was no question of Aurangzeb asking for the friendship of Sambhaji and the latter setting a price for it. Aurangzeb's aim was the physical destruction of the enemy and this he achieved." Aurangzeb carried out the physical destruction of Sambhaji by not involving himself in its decision but by involving others.** This is proved by the account of that decision given by Saki Mustaidkhan.[50] He has stated that "In consideration of the harshness and insult that he had practised by slaying and imprisoning Muslims and plundering the cities of Islam, the destruction of this wicked infidel preponderated over the reasons for keeping him alive and the decisions of the masters of the Holy Law and Faith and the counsel of the dignitaries of the Church and State were in favour of despatching this hellish robber (Sambhaji). Therefore, after the arrival of the Emperor at Koregaon*on 3rd March, 1689, Sambhaji was executed along with Kavi Kalash with the sword on Monday, the 11th March, 1689."

" The treatment of Sambhaji's dead body does not reflect any credit on Aurangzeb."[51] According to Khafikhan[52] and

---

** I am grateful to Shri. Setu Madhavrao Pagadi for this suggestion.

50. Massir-i-Alamgiri-Pagadi, p.41.

* Sambhaji was executed at Vadhu near Koregaon. At Vadhu exists the shrine of Sambhaji (Bendre-Sambhaji, Pp.617-620).

51. Pagadi-Maratha Mughal Relations, p.57.

52. Khafikhan-Pagadi, p.20.

unsuccessful reign, Sambhaji has become a martyr in the history of the Marathas. About him Ishwardas Nagar has said, "that man of self-respect refused to touch food served by the guards (in the camp of Aurangzeb). He met his death calmly and unflinchingly".[54]

Probably, the martyrdom of Sambhaji has led some historians[55] to overlook the fact that it was during his reign that the Svarajya had not remained a strong political entity as it was during the period of Shivaji. In addition to the territory of Bagalana and all its forts, the Marathas had lost the forts of Mahuli, Kothala and Sarasgad, which were important from strategical point of view. The Mughal armies had penetrated substantially in the areas of Kalyan, Poona, Raigad, Kolhapur, Panhala, and the Maratha state was put on the defensive against the advancing Mughal armies after the fall of the Kingdom of Golkonda. Financially, the Svarajya had become bankrupt. Neither Sambhaji nor Hirji Mahadik the Subhedar of Jinji could repay a loan of a paltry amount of 1500 Pagodas* taken by Sambhaji from the French.[56] Sambhaji also could not pay the English the agreed sum of money for the help which they were giving him

---

54. Futuhate Alamgiri-Pagadi, p.31.
55. For example, see Bendre-Sambhaji, p.167;
Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.437.
* A Pagoda was in equivalence with Rs.3½ (See → Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.383,F.N.).
56. Kosambi, D.D.,-Pondicherry Morged, (BISMQ XI,No.2,Pp.31-32).

against the Mughals. That led English to stop that help. As Sambhaji could not pay his troops regularly and in a required manner, some of them joined the service of Aurangzeb. As has been shown earlier, the Maratha administration was dominated by Kavi Kalash, the Chandogamatya, and due to that the other ministers were not doing the work of their departments as they used to do under Shivaji. Therefore, as the Ajnapatra of Ramachandrapant Amatya has pointed out "during the reign of Sambhaji the Svarajya had become a disorganized political entity".[57]

Sambhaji's Wives and Children

Queen Yesubai was the only wife of Chhatrapati Sambhaji. The extant records do not show that he had any other wives than Yesubai. She had two children. Out of them one was her daughter Bhawanibai, who was born on 4th September, 1678.[58] The other one was her son, Shivaji (later Chhatrapati Shahu (1708-1749 A.D.), who was born on 18th May, 1682.[59]

Bhawanibai was married to Shankaraji Mahadik, the son of Hirji Mahadik. Her two sons were Durgoji and Arjoji. She went as a Sati after the death of Shankaraji.[60]

Chhatrapati Sambhaji also had another wife or a concubine. Her name was Durgabai.[61] It is not known from the extant sources as to from which family she came and as to

---

57. Ajnapatra-Khare and Bhide, p.21.
58. Sambhaji Shakavali, p.100.
59. Ibid., p.112.
60. Bendre-Sambhaji, p.648.
61. TKK I, No.143, p.195; No.322, p.484; No.361,p.548.

when Sambhaji married her. She seems to have accompanied Sambhaji when he had deserted to the Mughals on 13th December, 1678. It seems that Sambhaji could not carry her with him when he left the Mughal camp and escaped to the Svarajya in December, 1679. The Mughals then seem to have kept her in custody at the fort of Ahmednagar. Sambhaji's troops constantly exerted to rescue her from that fort. Therefore, the Mughals seem to have shifted her in the fort of Daulatabad. Sambhaji, then sent his men like Girjoji Yadav at different times to secure the news of her well-being.[62] Her release from the Mughal custody was solicited by Chhatrapati Shahu in 1718.[63] She was probably released after that by the Mughal emperor.

There is also a mention of a wife of Sambhaji in the Busatinussalatin. It is stated in it that 'Sambhaji slipped out the camp of Dilerkhan (at Athani) with his'wife' disguised in male attire".[64] Information about her is not available in the extant sources.

It is stated in the Futuhate Alamgiri[65] that " a concubine of Sambhaji was kept in custody by the Mughals

---

62. Ibid.
63. Sardesai,Kulkarni, and Kale,(Ed.), Aitihasik Patravyavahar, Pp.8-9.
64. Busatinussalatin-Parasnis-Bendre, p.560. Sarkar-Shivaji, p.327, feels that she was Yesubai. He is not correct in that matter. For, as has been shown earlier, Yesubai had given birth to her daughter Bhawanibai on 4th September, 1678, and she must not be in a position to accompany Sambhaji in his hazardous journey to the Mughal camp when he deserted the Svarajya on 13th December, 1678. Moreover, the name of Yesubai is not given the Busatinussalatin.
65. Futuhate Alamgiri-Pagadi, p.26.

in the fortress of Ashirgad. In the same source, there is also a mention of Mansing and Madansing as the sons of Sambhaji.[66] They had surrendered to the Mughals along with Yesubai and Shahu after the fall of Raigad in Novemver, 1689. They seem to be his illegitimate sons.[67] It is not known from the extant sources as to what were the names of their mother. But the presence of those sons indicates the fact that Sambhaji had concubines. Mansing (Mudhosing) died in the Mughal custody on 10th September, 1698.[68] The release of Madansing and Yesubai was requested by Chhatrapati Shahu in 1718.[69] The Mughal emperor then released Yesubai. Along with her he probably released Madansing.

The Massir-i-Alamgiri has given the information that the two wives, a daughter, and three female servants of Sambhaji were in the custody of the Mughal commandant of Bahadurgad.[70] The information about the names of those wives and the daughter of Sambhaji is not available in the extant historical sources. Since there is no mention of the marriage of Sambhaji with other women

---

~~65. Futuhat-i-Alamgiri-Pagadi, p.26.~~
66. Ibid., p. 34; Mansing is probably regarded as Madhavsing by Sardesai - Rajaram, p. 102.
67. Sardesai - Sambhaji, Pp.105-106.
68. Sardesai, Ibid. ~~Same~~
69. Sardesai, Kulkarni, and Kale, (Ed.), - Aitihasik Patravyavahar, Pp.8-9.
70. Massir-i-Alamgiri-Pagadi, p.28.

than his marriage with Yesubai, those women seem to be the concubines of Sambhaji. Similarly that daughter appears to be an illegitimate daughter of Sambhaji. Probably it was she who was married in 1704 to Muhammad Muhiyuddin, the son of Sultan Sikandar Adilshah, the last ruler of the Bijapur Kingdom.[71]

It is clear from these facts that Sambhaji had a weakness for women. But his diversions with women do not seem to have affected adversely his activities of the state policies.

---

71. Ibid., p. 134.

Chapter IX

ADMINISTRATION OF CHHATRAPATI SAMBHAJI

(1680 - 1689 A.D.)

From the various documents which have come to light, it is possible to know about the working of the administration of Chhatrapati Sambhaji (1680-1689).

As has been pointed out earlier, the administration of the Svarajya was managed by Chhatrapati Sambhaji with the assistance of the Chhandogamatya and the Council of Eight Ministers. The data available in the extant documents of the reign of Chhatrapati Sambhaji gives the following information about the administration of the Svarajya during 1680-1689.

Chhatrapati Sambhaji was the head of the administration of the Svarajya. As a Chhatrapati he was the head of the civil, military, legislative, judicial and ecclesiastical matters of the Svarajya. To perform these duties, he had under him the Chhandogamatya and the Council of Eight Ministers. Their duties were as follows.

Chhandogamatya. As has been pointed out earlier, it was a new post created by Chhatrapati Sambhaji in the Maratha government. It was given by Sambhaji to his spiritual preceptor, Kavi Kalash. As the Chhandogamatya, Kavi Kalash acted as a link between the Chhatrapati and his other ministers. As has been shown earlier, he got the work of the different departments of the ministers done according to the Chhanda (desire or whim) of the Chhatrapati. As a result, he became a very influential and important person

in the administration of Sambhaji. He also wielded tremendous influence on Sambhaji, his administration, policies and enjoyed his highest confidence.[1] Therefore though there existed in theory the Council of Eight ministers in the administration of Sambhaji, its ministers could not perform, from real point of view, their duties as were performed by the ministers of Shivaji.

The duties and the work of the ministers of that Council which were laid down during the time of Chhatrapati Shivaji seem to have been the same under Sambhaji.

Peshva or the Prime Minister. He was next to the Chhatrapati in the working of the Maratha administration and was at the head of both the civil and military administration.[2] He was to perform all works of administration. He was to put his seal on the Royal documents (Adnyapatras). He was to undertake expeditions with the army and execute necessary arrangements for the protection of the territory which will be conquered, and act according to the orders of the Chhatrapati. All the military officers and the army were to follow him. They all were to work together.[3]

---

1. Bendre-Maharashtretihasachi Sadhane I,No.23, p.185; Gaikwad,K.A.(Ed.), Karvir Saradaranchya Kaifiyati,p.18; Vrajratnadas, Maasirul Umara,I,Pp.418-419; Chitrav, Siddheshwar Shastri,(Ed.), Bharat Varshiya Madhyayugin Charitra Kosh, p.209; Ranade,M.G., Rise of the Maratha Power, Pp.175-176; Keladiya Nripa Vijayam, p.64; Kincaid, C.A., and Parasnis, D.B.,History of the Maratha People II, Pp.20-21.
2. Ranade, M.G., Ibid., p.126.
3. Shri Shiva Chhatrapati Yani Rajyabhishekanantar Ashta Pradhanadikana Dilele Adhikar, (Itihas Ani Aitihasik Vividha Vishaya, Khanda I, p.22).

Apparently, Nilakantha Moreshwar, who was the Peshva in the administration of Sambhaji, was next in power to the Chhatrapati. But he did not enjoy that position in the actual working of that administration. For, as has been shown earlier, he was required to tell the persons, who had approached him for employment that " In this Kingdom (of Sambhaji) entreaty on behalf of others (on our part) wont work. All the entreaty on behalf of others is given to Kavi Kalash Kabjibaba. (Therefore) You go to him. Give him money for his expenses, and he will arrange for your employment".[4] This shows that in the administration of Chhatrapati Sambhaji the Peshva had no say even to recommend persons for ordinary jobs.

Amatya or the Mujumdar. He was to check all the accounts of public income and expenditure and report about them to the Chhatrapati. He was to countersign all statements of accounts both of the Kingdom in general and of the particular districts. He was also to undertake military expeditions and protect the territory (of the Svarajya). He was to act according to the orders of the Chhatrapati.

During June - October, 1680, Kavi Kalash seems to have been the Amatya of Sambhaji. After that from October, 1680, to September, 1681, Annaji Datto acted as the Amatya. After the death of Annaji Datto, it was

---

4. Gokhale-Sambhaji, Pp.352-353.

Khanderao Pansambal, who was the Amatya probably upto January, 1683. Then Sambhaji gave that post to Raghunath Narayan Hanamante. His death on 4th May, 1683, made Sambhaji give that post to his son, Narayan Raghunath.[5]

Senapati or the Sarnaubat. He was to look after the management of the military troops. He was to undertake expeditions in order to conquer additional territories. He was to protect that territory, render accounts of the spoils, and act according to the orders of the Chhatrapati. He was to report the grievances and the needs of the troops to the Chhatrapati. All the commanders of the army were to act according to his orders.

Hambirrao Mohite was the Senapati of Sambhaji upto December, 1687. After the death of Hambirrao in the battle of Wai, Malhoji Ghorpade was appointed to that post by Sambhaji.[6]

Panditrao and Dandhyaksha or the minister of ecclesiastical matters. It was his function to honour and reward learned Brahmanas and scholars on behalf of the Chhatrapati. He was required to decide theological questions and caste disputes and to fix dates for religious ceremonies. He was to punish impiety and heresy and to order penances, etc.

Moreshwar Raghunath acted as the Panditrao and Dandhyaksha of Sambhaji upto 1686. After him Keshav Pandit

---

5. Ibid., p.348.
6. Bendre-Sambhaji, p.132.

was the Panditrao of Sambhaji[7] in the remaining period of the reign of Sambhaji.

Nyayadhish or the Chief Justice. He was having jurisdiction over all suits in the Svarajya. He was to try those righteously after finding out what was wrong and what was right. He was to endorse all judicial decisions.

Pralhad Niraji was the Nyayadhish of Sambhaji during the period of his reign.[8]

Sachiv or Shuru-navis (Surnis) or the Superintendent. He was to see that all royal letters were drafted in proper style. He was to correct the mistakes if there were any in those letters. He was also required to undertake expeditions and conquer new territories. He was to protect that territory (from the enemies) and act according to the orders of the Chhatrapati. On the royal letters and documents he was to put his seal as a sign of his approval.

During May - September, 1680, Annaji Datto's Mutalik did his work of the Sachiv. After that it was given to Ramachandra Nilakantha by Sambhaji upto 1685. Sambhaji then gave it to Shankaraji Narayan Gandekar.[9] He continued to work as a Sachiv in the remaining period of the reign of Sambhaji.[9]

Mantri or Waqia-navis or the Chronicler. His duty was to complete a daily record of the King's doings and Court

---

7. Ibid., p.131.
8. Ibid., p.130.
9. Ibid., p.129.

incidents, and to watch over the King's invitation-lists, meals, companions, etc., so as to guard against murder plots, etc. He was to protect the territory (of the Svarajya) and undertake expeditions. He was to put his sign of approval on the official documents.

Dattaji Trimal was the Mantri of Sambhaji during the period of his reign.[10]

Sumanta or Dabir or the Foreign Secretary. He was to be the King's adviser on relations with foreign states, war and peace. It was also his duty to keep intelligence about other countries, to receive and dismiss foreign envoys, and maintain the dignity of the Svarajya abroad. He was to undertake expeditions (against the enemies) and put his sign of approval on state documents.

Janardanpant Hanamante was the Sumanta or the Dabir of Sambhaji upto 28th June, 1683.[11] It seems that his son Vasudev Janardan became the Dabir after his death. But the period of his office is not known. After him, his son Balakrishna Vasudev was the Dabir of Sambhaji during the remaining period of his reign.[12]

The actual work of correspondence of the government of Sambhaji was conducted by the officials known as the Chitnis.

The work of the military and revenue matters was

---

10. Sardesai-Sambhaji, p.33.
11. Sambhaji Shakavali, p.115.
12. Bendre-Sambhaji, p.132.

conducted by different subordinate officials.

With the above stated administrative machinery, Chhatrapati Sambhaji ruled over the Svarajya during 1680-1689.

Since Chhatrapati Sambhaji was at war with the Mughals and the Portuguese throughout the period of his reign (1680-1689), he had practically no time to add anything new in the matters settled already by Chhatrapati Shivaji in the administration of the Svarajya. Therefore he continued the things which existed in the Maratha administration during the reign of Shivaji.[13]

The administrative and judicial arrangements which Shivaji had made for the better government of the Svarajya and which were continued by Sambhaji during 1680-1689, were as follows :-

(i) The Central Administrative Machinery :

Rajmandal or the King and His Court. The chief constituent parts of the Rajmandal were the King and his eight ministers. During the reign of Sambhaji, the office of the Chhandogamatya might have been added to it. It seems that the private secretaries (Darakdars) of Chhatrapati Sambhaji also acted as the secretaries for the State or the Rajmandal, and even sat in a Majlis (a royal Court) held to decide important suits, with the other members of

---

13. Gune - Judicial System of the Marathas, p.30.

the Rajmandal.[14] Besides these there was a large staff of subordinate officers (Mutaliks and Dimmat Loka) and servants (Sevak) attached to each department.[15]

As a central secretariat, the Rajmandal seems to have been divided into eight departments:- (i)The Swami or the King himself, (ii) Ashta Pradhan or the eight ministers, (iii) Subhe Laskar or the house-hold troops of the King, (iv) Sardeshmukhi or the Private Watans of the King, (v) Kille Nihaya or the administration of the forts, (vi) Hashamrao or the Foot-guards,(vii)Subhe Mamaledar or the local government, and (viii) Watandars. The heads of these departments sat in the Rajsabha held to decide the suits of high importance.[16]

All the high officers of the State, the ministers and others who thus formed the Rajmandal were chosen by Chhatrapati Sambhaji himself. They held their offices during his pleasure.

The Rajmandal worked in a dual capacity as a council of administrators and a court of law for the Chhatrapati. In the former capacity it gave advice to the King, served as a check to his supreme powers and managed the administration of the Svarajya.[17] Its members, mainly the ministers and the private

---

14. Gune-Judicial System of the Marathas, p.27.
15. SCS Khanda IX, No.65, p.66; No.66, p.67.
16. Gune-Judicial System of the Marathas, p.27, F.N.3.
17. Sabnis-Bavada Daftar I, No.23,p.34. This document of 1690 shows that all the members of the Rajmandal and Maharani Tarabai, who was acting as a Regent of her son Chhatrapati Shivaji I of Kolhapur, took a Vatan policy decision (in a meeting of the Rajmandal). This proves that during the reign of Sambhaji (1680-1689) also the same procedure of taking important decisions might have been followed. That indicates that the King did not take important decisions himself.

secretaries of the Chhatrapati, were required to countersign the orders issued by the State.[18]

" As a court of law the Rajmandal was styled as the Rajmudra or Rajsabha and formed a permanent body of the Huzur Hazir Majlis (judicial assembly) summoned to decide the suits of high importance."[19]

(ii) The Local Administrative Machinery :

(1) The Divisions of Ministers or Sarkarkuns or Sarsurbhas. The territory of the Svarajya was divided into Prants or Sarsubhas or provinces. Each was placed under the supervision of the Peshva, the Sachiv, and the Mantri, the Ministers or the Sarkarkuns or the Sarsubhas.

The Prant Rajmandal. The ministers or the Sarkarkuns were assisted by Sarsubhedars in the provincial administration. The province was sub-divided into Subhas which were equivalent to the modern districts in area.

The office of the Sarsubhedar was known as the Prant Rajmandal. The Sarsubhedar was assisted in his work by a Karkun.

It is not known whether there was a Majlis (court) attached to the division of the Province or the Prant.[20]

The Sarkarkun submitted the accounts annually to the Chhatrapati.

---

18. SPSS II, No.1643, p.490; No.1907, p.566.
19. Gune-Judicial System of the Marathas, p.28.
20. Ibid.

(2) The Subha(District). The Provinces or Prants were divided into Subhas (Districts). The territory of the Subha yielded an income of about a lakh of Hons to the Svarajya.

The Diwan-Subha. The office of the Subha was called as the Diwan-i-Subha. Its chief officer was the Subhedar. In its local administration, the Subhedar was helped by the Mujumdar or Karkun.

The Gota of a Subha. The Gota was a body of the Vatandars, Mirasdars (hereditary proprietors of the land), Uparis (tenants or farmers having no right of occupancy, as opposite to Thalakaris - the landed proprietors) and Rayas (the peasantry), which used to assemble to consider local administrative, judicial and social problems.

The Subha-Majlis. The decision by a Majlis (a court or assembly in general) formed of the Diwan (government officers of the Subha some of which were the Kazi, the Subhedar and the Majalasi or Sabhasad-Councillor) and the Gota was the accepted method of deciding suits during the period of Sambhaji. The government officers acted as intermediaries between the parties in dispute and the Gota. Their chief judicial duties were to register the suit, supervise the proceedings of the Gotasabha; if necessary, to transfer the suit to some other place (Thal) and to execute the award of the Majlis (Mahzar) or the order of their superior authority regarding the decision.

The Majalasi or Sabhasad or Councillor probably acted as a law officer for Hindus on behalf of the Hindus, along with the Kazi.[21]

(3) The Tarf, ~~Kavat~~ Karyat or Tapa or Sammat (Taluka). The Diwan Thana[22] (Havaldar), the Gota of the Tarf and the Thana-Majlis, carried the local administration of the Tarf.

(4) The Village. It was the smallest and the last unit of the administration of the Svarajya. The Mokadam and the village Gota were managing the village administration.

The village headman who was assisted by Kulkarni and Chaugula was in-charge of the the revenue collection of his village. The state officials supervised the work of the village officials. Those officials met the cultivators personally and,if necessary, collected the revenue themselves instead of relying entirely on the hereditary officials like the Deshmukh and Deshpande.

Through the agency of the above stated administration Chhatrapati Sambhaji managed the affairs of Svarajya in the following manner during the period of his reign(1680-1689).

Economy

Agriculture. Agriculture was the main source of income of the Svarajya. As Chhatrapati Sambhaji was busy in the work of warfare against the Mughals and the Portuguese

---

21. Ibid., p.25; 29.
22. SCS Khanda II, No.167, p.186; No.364,p.363.

during the entire period of his reign (1680-1689), he did not have time to do anything new in the system of the measurement and assessment of the land which was introduced in the Svarajya by Shivaji. Therefore, Sambhaji continued the system which Shivaji had evolved for the measurement and assessment of the agricultural land in the Svarajya.[23]

According to that system the agricultural land in the Svarajya was measured with a Shivashahi Kathi, whose length was eighty two tansus. Four hundred such square kathis made a bigha, and one hundred and twenty square bighas made a chavar. Thus the land in the villages of the Svarajya was measured in Chavars.[24]

The Maratha government then prepared a record of the arable land in the Svarajya. Then the land of the village was divided class-wise into first class, second class, third class, and fourth class land. For the proper assessment of those lands, the factors like the crop sown, the second crop taken in the land, and the probability of the increased yield in the land if more labour was applied to it for cultivation, were taken into account. The task of estimating the produce was left to the hereditary officials and the cultivators of the village concerned as they had the proper knowledge

---

23. Aitihasik Sadhane-Avalaskar, No.66,Pp.111-113.
24. Sabhasad-Shivaji Bakhar, p.26.

of the local conditions. For that work, the Pargana hereditary officials were associated, in every village they visited, with village officials and some prominent villagers in the task of estimating the produce of the whole village. All those three elements - Pargana officials, village officials, and the villagers, to-gether had to agree upon the estimate of the produce of the village under consideration.[25]

Chhatrapati Shivaji had fixed the rent at 33 per cent of the gross produce of the land earlier, but afterwards, it was increased to 40 per cent when he had abolished all the taxes and extra cesses which the agriculturist was required to pay previously.[26]

Chhatrapati Sambhaji saw to it that his officers carried out their work of agriculture in co-operation of the Deshmukhs. This is apparent from his Adnyapatra of 21st November, 1685, written to Antaji Sambadev, the Deshadhikari of Prant Wai, who was not co-operative with the Deshmukh of that Prant. Through that document, Sambhaji ordered Antaji Sambadev to co-operate with the Deshmukh in the work of the cultivation of the land.[27]

Taxes on the Cash-crops. It is probable that the garden lands producing cash crops like sugercane, ginger, turmeric,

---

25. Kulkarni, A.R.-Maharashtra in the Age of Shivaji, Pp.152-153.
26. Sen-Administrative System of the Marathas, p.73.
27. SCS Khanda II, No.272, p.268.

vegetables (onions, brinjal, sweet potatoes, etc.), plantains, etc., with the help of canal water, which were paying taxes during the reign of Shivaji[28] were also paying those taxes to the government of Sambhaji. The government of Sambhaji also used to collect taxes from the producers of coconuts and betel-nuts.[29]

Direct Taxes

The government of Chhatrapati Shivaji used to levy many direct taxes on incomes of persons, professions and property. Since some of those taxes were collected by the government of Sambhaji, it is probable that the remaining taxes were also in vogue during his reign.

Government Dues. " The deductions from the income of the various hereditary officials of the Pargana or village formed a tax on income. It was a tax levied on their collection from the Pargana or the village.... Some of those taxes were not of regular type."[30]

Inam Khandani was a levy collected from the inamdars (rent-free land-holders). The government of Chhatrapati Sambhaji used to collect it.[31]

Inampatti was a tax which was occasionally imposed on the inamdars in the time of exigency. That tax was not collected from the inams which were granted to the religious establishments and the mathas. It is likely that the

---

28. Kulkarni, A.R.-Maharashtra in the Age of Shivaji, Pp.155-156.
29. SCS Khanda IX, No.69, Pp.73-75.
30. Kulkarni, A.R.-Maharashtra in the Age of Shivaji, P.107.
31. Sambhaji Kalin Patrasar Samgraha, No.57, p.17.

government of Sambhaji collected this tax.

Miraspatti or Mirasdarpatti was a tax which was levied on a Mirasdar (a peasant proprietor), who was making profits out of his Mirasi property (hereditary property), by Shivaji.[32] That might have been continued by Sambhaji also.

Professional Tax. Almost all the professions in the Svarajya were brought within the scope of this tax during the reign of Sambhaji.

Sarafi or Sarafpatti. Sarafi means a business of a Shroff (money-changer). Therefore, Sarafpatti was a tax on that business. The government of Sambhaji had levied that tax on the Shroffs.[33]

The documents show that a profession tax was required to be paid to Sambhaji's government by the carpenters, barbers, guravs, blacksmiths, washerman, grocers, goldsmiths, braziers, oilmen, fishermen, cobblers, weavers, and potters.[34]

Vethbegari. "It was an indirect and invisible tax, a tax in kind or service. It means forced labour. Forced labour exacted from skilled and unskilled labourers at less than market rates or without payment also formed a tax on the income of labourers. It can, therefore, be

---

32. SCS Khanda I, No.55, Pp.75-76.
33. SCS Khanda IX, No.70, p.76.
34. Sardesai-Peshwa Daftar XXXI, No.104, p-89.

considered as a professional tax. Vethbegari was a privilege enjoyed by the hereditary officials. By conceding this ' hak ' to the officials, the state avoided the expenditure that it had to incur otherwise.[35] This tax existed during the reign of Chhatrapati Sambhaji.[36]

Indirect Taxes. The government of Chhatrapati Sambhaji levied indirect taxes in order to earn income for the Svarajya. Amongst those taxes the important ones were the customs duties (Jakat). Customs duties were charged upon commodities imported into or exported from the Svarajya.

Since the agreement which Chhatrapati Sambhaji had with the English in 1684,[37] indicates that the English were to pay "the usual customs " on the goods they will import and export in the Svarajya, it is clear that the government of Sambhaji was earning income through the customs duties. The extant documents do not give exact information about the customs duties which were levied by the government of Sambhaji. Such information is also not available of the reign of Shivaji because of the paucity of the documents though those documents indicate that the government of Shivaji used to levy the customs duties on the import and export of goods in the Svarajya. Therefore, it is assumed by the scholars that the

---

35. Kulkarni,A.R.-Maharashtra in the Age of Shivaji,p.111.
36. SCS Khanda IX, No.63, Pp.64-65.
37. Bendre-Maharashtretihasachi Sadhane II, No.158,Pp.184-188.

customs duties charged by Shivaji's government were the ones whose mention is found in the documents of either the Malik Amber period or the Peshwa period.[38] On the basis of that it appears that the government of Shivaji levied the import and export duties on Rice, Nagli, Jaggery, Spices, Sugarcane, Ginger, Tobaco, Cloth, Yarn, Blankets, Horses, Buffaloes, Bullocks,[39] etc. It is construed from this that the government of Sambhaji also must have continued to levy those custom duties during 1680-1689.

The government of Sambhaji also levied Octroi duties on various goods brought into a district for consumption. Those octroi duties were called as ' Cungi ' and 'Majura'. The goods on which the Octroi duties were charged were : different grains, Spices, Saffron, Kasturi, Jaggery, Sugar, Garlic, Onion, Molasses, Turmeric, Tamarind, Pepper, Coconut-Kernel, Dates, Ghee, Honey, Oil, different types of Cloth Yarn, Hemp, Blankets, Caps of different sizes, Watermelons, Coconuts, Jack-fruits, Lemons, Betel-nuts and leaves, Plantains, Fish, Glass, Combs, Bamboos, Soap, Shoes, Lamps, Fisherman's nets, Small boats, Carts, Palanquins,[40] etc. The government of Sambhaji also seems to have levied a duty on the sale and purchase of animals which were brought to the market for sale. That tax was called as ' Singoti '. It was a duty or fee exacted from

---

38. Kulkarni,A.R.-Maharashtra in the Age of Shivaji,p.112.
39. Ibid., p.114.
40. Ibid., Pp.115-116.

the purchaser of a horned beast. Accordingly, that tax was paid by the subjects of the Svarajya on the Buffaloes, Oxes, Cows, etc. The tax which was to be paid on the horse was known as the Teji or Taji. The cess levied perhaps on the transport of camels was known as 'Utpatti'. The government of Sambhaji used to collect a tax known as Vanataka on the cattle. On the transport of cattle it used to collect a duty which was known as Sail-Bail. On the persons, who owned more than two buffaloes also that government had imposed a tax.[41] The purchase of male or female slaves was required to pay a tax to the Maratha government.[42] The government of Sambhaji also earned an income from a tax on salt.[43]

Miscellaneous Taxes. There were several miscellaneous sources of income which were tapped by the government of Chhatrapati Sambhaji. The extant documents show that a tax on marriage known as Varadtaka or Lagnataka was collected by that government.[44] In the case of a re-marriage, it collected a tax known as Patdam.[45] Ghartaka[46] was a tax which it had imposed on every house in the Svarajya. A subject of the Svarajya was required to pay a tax to the government of Sambhaji when

---

41. SCS Khanda IX, No.69, Pp.73-75.
42. Ibid., Pp.116-117.
43. SCS Khanda IX, No.69, Pp.73-75.
44. Sardesai-Peshwa Daftar XXXI, No.104,p.89.
45. Ibid.
46. Ibid., p.88; SCS Khanda IX, No.69, Pp.73-75.

he adopted a son.[47] A tax known as Bhut-Pharosi[48] was levied by that government on the Bhut-Pharosis (image i.e. toy sellers). A tax known as the Angabhade, which was probably a tax on the pilgrims who used to go by a boat to some sacred place near Antruj (near Fonda), was collected by the government of Sambhaji upto March, 1688. Chhatrapati Sambhaji abolished that tax through his Adnyapatra of 22nd March, 1688, which was addressed to Dharmaji Nagnath, the Mukhya Deshadhikari of Prant Mamle Fonda.[49]

Fees and Fines

The government of Chhatrapati Sambhaji obtained income through the judicial fees known as Serni or Harki.[50] It was a payment paid to the court by the successful litigant. It is defined as a present made to Government or to a court in testification of gratitude for favours afforded or justice rendered.[51]

Sambhaji's government also secured income through the agency of a fine known as Gunhegari[52] which was imposed by the court on a culprit or on a loser of a suit in civil matters.

War Gains

In his activity of war against Aurangzeb during 1680-1689,

---

47. Sambhaji Kalin Patrasar Samgraha, No.39,p.12.
48. Sardesai-Peshwa Daftar XXXI, No.104, Pp.88-89.
49. Sambhaji Kalin Patrasar Samgraha, No.257,p.85.
50. Sambhaji Kalin Patrasar Samgraha, No.217, p.71.
51. Kulkarni, A.R.-Maharashtra in the Age of Shivaji,p.128.
52. Rajwade Khanda XV, No.12, Pp.46-50.

Chhatrapati Sambhaji had directed the attacks of the Maratha troops in the Mughal territories in order to carry out their loot and destruction. As a result, the Maratha troops entered in the Mughal territories of Bagalana, Ahmednagar, Sholapur, Aurangabad, Bhir, Osmanabad, Nanded, Berar, Khandesh, etc; to carry out those aims. In those territories, they conducted loot and captured animals and property of the Mughal subjects. They also looted the prosperous Mughal cities like Burhanpur, Chanda, Malkapur, Karanja, etc. Those items of loot were handed over by the Maratha commanders to the government of Sambhaji.[53] As a result, the loot formed a part of the income of the government of Sambhaji.

In their war against the Portuguese also the troops of Sambhaji had looted the Portuguese territories of Saste and Bardesh.

Chauth or Khandani

Chauth or Khandani was a tribute paid by the weak ruler to the strong or superior ruler. " It was a military contribution levied by a power without being in formal occupation of the country."[54] In the reign of Sambhaji the Maratha troops had collected Chauth from the Mughal territories of Berar, Khandesh, Bagalana, Bidar, Jalna, Balaghat, etc. That amount of Chauth went to the government treasury of Sambhaji. Therefore, Chauth was an item

---

53. Sardesai-Sambhaji, p.85.
54. Sen-Administrative System of the Marathas, p.97; Kulkarni, A.R.-Maharashtra in the Age of the Shivaji, Pp.129-133.

of the income of the government of Sambhaji.

Rudrappa, the Desai of Murgud was paying an yearly Khandani of ten thousand Hons to Chhatrapati Shivaji. He continued to pay the same to Sambhaji.[55]

Sardeshmukhi

Sardeshmukhi was a collection of ten per cent of a tax imposed upon the whole revenue of the Subha of the Deccan.[56] Like Chhatrapati Shivaji, Sambhaji also claimed the Sardeshmukhi, as he considered himself as the supreme head of the country.

That the Sardeshmukhi was collected by Sambhaji is proved by a document of 30th October, 1687.[57] That document shows that the people of the Chaul Mamla requested a remission in the land revenue to the government of Sambhaji on the grounds that destruction of their territory was carried out by the enemies (Siddis). The Maratha Subhedar of Chaul, Ranaji Sadak Prabhu, then granted many concessions to those people, out of which exemption from the payment of Sardeshmukhi was one.

Subsidy

In 1677, Sultan Abul Hassan Kutubshah alias Tanashah (1672-1687) had promised to pay Chhatrapati Shivaji a regular subsidy of one lakh Hons for the defence of Golkonda against the Mughals.[58] After Shivaji, Chhatrapati Sambhaji also

---

55. SCS Khanda XII, No.87, Pp.54-55; No.88,p.55.
56. Kulkarni, A.R.-Maharashtra in the Age of Shivaji,p.133.
57. SCS Khanda IX, No.69, Pp.71-76.
58. Sarkar-Auranzib IV, p.335.

received that subsidy[59] upto the time of the conquest of Golkonda by Aurangzeb in September, 1687.

Total Revenue

It is apparent from the above tax structure, which touched the subjects of all the income and profession levels in the Svarajya, that the government of Sambhaji must have acquired a measurably good revenue at the time when after Shivaji he became the Chhatrapati in June, 1680. As the Svarajya was yielding a revenue of more than one crore of Hons[60] at the time of the death of Shivaji (3rd April, 1680),[61] it can be construed that the government of Sambhaji must be also getting that much revenue.

But the revenue of the government of Sambhaji went on decreasing every year during the period of his reign as a result of the destruction of the territories of the Svarajya caused by the Mughal armies during 1681-1689.[62] The Siddis of Janjira[63] also looted and burnt the territory of north Konkan from time to time. The Portuguese of Goa, who had taken the side of the Mughals in the Mughal-Maratha conflict, were not slow in attacking and destroying the territories of the Svarajya during 1680-1689.[64]

---

59. Ibid., p.341, F.N.
60. Kulkarni, A.R.-Maharashtra in the Age of Shivaji, p.134.
61. Sabhasad-Shivaji Bakhar, p.109.
62. TKK-II, No.3, p.4; Kavyetihas Samgraha Patra & Yadi Vagaire Lekh, No.13, p.36; Portuguese Daftar-Desai, p.55.
63. SCS Khanda IX, No.60, p.62.
64. Ibid., Portuguese Daftar-Desai, p.50.

That destruction carried out in the territories of the Svarajya by the Mughals, the Siddis and the Portuguese gave a set-back to agriculture, industry, and trade of the Svarajya. As a result, the revenue yield of the government of Sambhaji declined in the every succeeding year of his reign and he was required to borrow a paltry loan of 1500 Pagodas from the French factory of Rajapur on the condition that it will be repaid by his governor of Jinji (Hirji Mahadik) to the French treasury of Pondichery. But the finances of Jinji were also not in good condition. Therefore, Hirji Mahadik could pay only 280 Pagodas to the French when they asked him to repay that loan of 1500 Pagodas.[65]

The depletion of the revenue yield during the reign of Sambhaji is also indicated by the fact that he could not pay the agreed amount of money to the English, who were helping him against Aurangzeb and the Siddis.[66]

Due to the depletion of the revenue of the Svarajya, it seems that Sambhaji had to meet the heavy expenses of war against the Siddis, Mughals and the Portuguese from the wealth which Shivaji had left in the treasury of the Svarajya.* As that wealth also got exhausted, the Svarajya became a bankrupt country by the time when the Mughals captured Sambhaji at Samgameshwar on 1st February, 1689.

---

65. Bendre-Maharashtretihasachi Sadhane II,No.178,Pp.207-208.
66. Sambhaji Kalin Patrasar Samgraha, No.243,p.81.
* For the wealth of Shivaji, See-Sabhasad-Shivaji Bakhar, Pp.96-97.

Work of the Civil Administration

The civil administration of Chhatrapati Sambhaji had to work under abnormal conditions as throughout the period of his reign (1680-1689) Sambhaji was at war with the Siddis, the Mughals, and the Portuguese. The extant records give the following picture about the working of that administration.

Sambhaji's Reconciliation with Annaji Datto

Sambhaji was a well-trained prince in the matters of the administration of the Svarajya. As has been pointed out earlier, in 1678, he had directed properly the case of the inam land of Sadananda Gosavi of Nimb to Annaji Datto Sachiv for settlement[67] and had not settled it himself even though he was a Yuvaraj at that time.

He also knew the value of Annaji Datto in the administration of the Svarajya. Therefore, he retained Annaji Datto, who was in the administration of Shivaji what Raja Todarmal was under Akbar, and what Malik Amber was under the Nizamshahas,[68] in his administration. He also gave the Deshkulkarni Vatan of Sangameshwar to Annaji Datto, as that vatan was vacant[69] (did not have a owner). But the civil administration of Sambhaji did not have the benefit of the skilled services of Annaji Datto

---

67. Rajwade Khanda XV, No.142, p.176.
68. Joshi-Rajyakarbharacha Itihas, p.139.
69. Bendre-Maharashtretihasachi Sadhane II, No.302,p.329.

for long. For, in 1681, Sambhaji put Annaji Datto to death as he was implicated in a plot against him. Though he had punished Annaji Datto, Sambhaji did not show spirit of acrimony towards Annaji's son, Raghunath Annaji, and he allowed the continuance of the Deshkulkarni vatan of Sangameshwar of Annaji to Raghunath.[70]

Role of Sambhaji in the Civil Administration

Chhatrapati Sambhaji took keen interest in the working of the civil administration of the Svarajya. This is proved by the following cases, which he had settled personally.

Rudrappa Naik Desai of Murgud had reported to Sambhaji that "he was collecting the Khandani of the Murgud Paragana according to the orders of Sambhaji. He was also sending it to Katorgad in order to defray the expenses of its establishment and buildings. He experienced difficulties in sending that amount to Katorgad as the Maratha officer, Vitthal Hari, who had come in the territory of Murgud, was asking him to make payments from it at different times." On that Chhatrapati Sambhaji asked Rudrappa Desai to pay that amount to Katorgad regularly (as was previously ordered by him) in order to meet its expenses of the establishment and buildings. He also told Rudrappa that he should not pay

---

70. Potdar, D.V.-Annaji Dattochi Vamshaval, (Shivaji Nibandhavali II, p.153).

any money to Vitthal Hari. Sending his Adnyapatra to this effect, Sambhaji also sent his own letter (Rokha) along with it for Vitthal Hari and asked Rudrappa to deliver that letter to him.[71]

Rudrappa had also reported to Sambhaji that Babaji Rakhamangad, the Subhedar of Bettegiri, had attacked two villages and had after capturing animals from those villages, had taken away the food grains from the grain-cellars of those villages.

About that matter Sambhaji wrote to Rudrappa that he was ordering Babaji Rakhamangad through his own letter (Rokha) to return to the villagers the things which he had taken away from their villages. He asked Rudrappa that meanwhile he should console those villagers and should give them confidence[72] (of the matter that such a thing will not take place again).

The other complaint of Rudrappa was about the Maratha Subhedar, Naro Ambaji. Rudrappa wrote to Sambhaji that the Santagirekars had quarreled with him and had after looting the villages (of his area) had carried away animals from those villages. He also communicated to Sambhaji that even though the actions of the Santagirekars were unjust, since Naro Ambaji was taking their side (was supporting them), they were constantly creating trouble

---

71. SCS Khanda XII, No.89, Pp.55-56.
72. Ibid.

in his (Rudrappa's) territory.

Chhatrapati Sambhaji then wrote a letter to Rudrappa. Along with that letter he also sent a Rokha (personal letter) for Naro Ambaji and asked Rudrappa to deliver it to him. He also told Rudrappa that according to that Rokha, Naro Ambaji will ask the Santagirikara to stop their mischievous activities.[73]

The letter of Dadaji Mahadeva Desai and Deshkulkarni, Mamle Chaul, addressed to the Subhedar and Karkun of Subha Prant Cheul on 11th February, 1684,[74] also proves that Sambhaji used to take personal interest in the matters of his civil administration.

In that letter it is stated that Sambhaji and his Peshva, Nilakantha Moreshwar, asked the Subhedar of Chaul to return all the valuables and other material to Dadaji Mahadev Desai as it was reported to them that those things were in an unjust manner taken away from the house of Dadaji Mahadev by Ragho Vishwanath, the former Subhedar of Chaul, who had a personal quarrel with Dadaji Mahadev.

The Deshmukhs had an important place in the working of the Svarajya. They were the hereditary officers of the Paraganas. Since the institution of the Deshmukh was very old, the Deshmukhs were held in high esteem by the population in Maharashtra. Their work was to supervise

---

73. Ibid.
74. SCS Khanda IX, No. 61, p.62.

the work of the Patils of their region; allot fallow state lands to applicants for bringing those under cultivation; make an annual round of villages under their jurisdiction in order to have a knowledge about the condition of villages and their residents; represent the claims of the villages for remission in revenue in the times of distress before the government, etc. Because of that the Deshmukhs were a link between the villages and the Maratha government.[75]

Since the Deshmukhs enjoyed that important position in the Society, many of them at times increased their strength in money and men, and became a source of trouble to the ruling authority. Chhatrapati Shivaji had understood that danger of the Deshmukhs to his authority. Therefore he had taken measures to curb the power of the Deshmukhs.[76]. To make his subjects free from the high-handedness of the Deshmukhs, Shivaji had appointed his Deshadhikaris to act as the heads of the Provincial administration. But as he had understood that the Deshmukhs were held in high esteem by his subjects, he asked his Deshadhikaris to work in co-operation with the Deshmukhs especially in the matters of settling revenue of the lands of their provinces.

---

75. Kulkarni, A.R.,-Maharashtra in the Age of Shivaji, Pp. 39-40.
76. Sabhasad-Shivaji Bakhar, Pp.26-27.

Chhatrapati Sambhaji had also understood the importance of the Deshmukhs in the working of the administration of the Svarajya. Since he was at war with the Mughals, he wanted the co-operation of the Deshmukhs to strengthen his war effort against the Mughals. He had asked some of them to recruit troops in their areas for that purpose. He had also visualized that he will have to secure the help of the Deshmukhs in many other ways in that war. As a result, the policy of Sambhaji was to keep the Deshmukhs satisfied in the Svarajya. Therefore, when Vitthal Shankar, the Deshadhikari of Prant Javali, did not allow Dattaji Keshavji Pisal, the Deshmukh of Tarf Jorekhore, the rights of his Vatan and other matters which were already settled by Shivaji, Chhatrapati Sambhaji admonished that Deshadhikari, and ordered him to allow Dattaji to enjoy his rights without any obstruction.[77]

Similarly, when he learnt that Antaji Sambadev, the Deshadhikari of Prant Wai, was not doing the work of agriculture in co-operation with the Deshmukh of that area, Chhatrapati Sambhaji ordered Antaji Sambadev to carry out that work with the co-operation of the Deshmukh.[78]

Efforts to boost Agriculture

In the war against the Svarajya, the Mughal troops had caused devastation of its territories during 1680-1689.

---

77. Sanads and Letters, No.1, p.161.
78. SCS Khanda II, No.272, p.268.

UNIVERSITY OF BOMBAY LIBRARY

That gave a set back to agriculture in the Svarajya. Agriculture in the Svarajya was also affected adversely due to the famine in Chakan[79] in 1685; in Borgaon[80] in 1686, and in Mal Shiras[81] in 1687. As a result, the government of Sambhaji took different measures to boost agriculture.

In his letter of 3rd June, 1684, addressed to Hari Shivadev, the Subhedar and Karkun of Tarf Cheul, Peshwa Nilkantha Moreshwar directed him to bring under cultivation the agricultural land of the villages which were confiscated by the government and which were otherwise would have remained uncultivated. For that reason he also asked Hari Shivadev to distribute to the cultivators of that area fifty Khandis of grains which were being sent to him from Sagargad.[82]

Peshwa Nilkantha Moreshwar also gave a Kaul (a written assurance of the government) to the people of Cheul, who were avoiding to undertake the work of agriculture, and asked them to undertake the cultivation of the lands without any doubts and suspicion in mind as the government had decided to carry out all the things they had desired.[83]

---

79. Sambhaji Kalin Patrasar Samgraha, Nos.186-187,p.62.
80. Rajwade Khanda III, No.560,Pp.502-503.
81. Rajwade Khanda XX, No.22, Pp.22-23.
82. Sambhaji Kalin Patrasar Samgraha, No.123,p.39.
83. Ibid., No.153, p.49.

The Deshmukh , Deshkulkarni and the cultivators of Mamle Cheul, who had reported their grievances and who were unwilling to undertake the work of cultivation, were consoled by Jivaji Hari, the Subhedar and Karkun of Sudhagad. In his Kaul of 10th January, 1687, Jivaji Hari promised them that they will not be bothered constantly by the revenue collectors in future in the matter of making the payment of their revenue dues. Promising them further that the government will satisfy their demands, he asked them to undertake the work of cultivation.[84]

The government of Sambhaji gave promises of safety to the Marathas who had returned to the Svarajya from the Mughal side and asked them to carry out the work of cultivation in their territories.[85] It also called back the people who had absconded because of their inability to pay taxes, and asked them to carry out their previous work of cultivation.[86]

Remission in Taxation

As the different territories of the Svarajya were often attacked and laid to waste by the Mughal troops during 1680-1689, its subjects were not always able to pay taxes to the government of Sambhaji. Therefore, that government granted remission in taxation whenever they requested for it.[87]

---

84. SCS Khanda IX, No.68, p.71.
85. For example, See, Sambhaji Kalin Patrasar Samgraha, No.263, p.87.
86. Ibid., No.265, p.88.
87. Peshwa Daftar XXXI, No.44,Pp.39-40; SCS Khanda IX, No.63, Pp.63-64; No.69,Pp.71-76; No.70,Pp.76-77; No.71,Pp.77-78.

Cancellation of Taxes

The government of Sambhaji responded to the feelings of piety expressed by the subjects and cancelled taxes which were thought as unreasonable by them. This is proved by the fact that on 22nd March, 1688, Chhatrapati Sambhaji cancelled a tax known as the Angabhade (a tax on the use of a boat), which was to be paid by the people, who used to come to Antruj in order to go to some sacred place for pilgrimage, when Samanayak Timanayak brought to his notice that such a tax on those people was not proper.[88]

Collection of the Arrears and Loans

The government of Sambhaji was keeping proper accounts of the arrears and the loans which it was to receive from its subjects. This is indicated by the fact that Chhandogamatya Kavi Kalash asked Tulji Desai of Prant Sirale on 27th May, 1688,[89] to make the payment of his arrears dues to the government.

Similarly, on 1st September, 1688, he asked the above stated Tulaji to pay the amount of loan of Sardeshmukhi which was against his name.[90]

Steps Against the Corrupt Administrators

Many traders, shopkeepers and subjects of the Svarajya used to attend the yearly festival which was held at the sacred place Chaphal. The collection of the taxes of that

---

88. Sambhaji Kalin Patrasar Samgraha, No.257,p.85.
89. SCS Khanda III, No.644, p.235.
90. Ibid., No.645, p.235; Sambhaji Kalin Patrasar Samgraha, No.267, p.88.

festival from the traders and shopkeepers was made at Nane Ghol and Tarale in the Subha of Karad. In 1685, Govind Gambhirrao, probably an official of the government administration in that area, unwarrantedly borrowed money from those traders and shopkeepers. That resulted in making some of them not to pay the regular taxes of that festival. That matter was brought to the notice of Raghunath Narayan Hanmante, the Amatya of Sambhaji, by Diwakar Gosavi, who was in charge of the religious establishment at Chaphal. Therefore, Raghunath Narayan Hanmante wrote to the Subhedar and Karkun of Subha Karad on 19th September, 1685, and asked him to put an end to the unwarranted activities of Govind Gambhirrao.[91]

Similarly some officials of the Maratha government used to borrow money unwarrantedly from the traders, who used to go to the festival at Chaphal. As that activity of the officials had caused a dread in the mind of the traders, it was felt likely that it will affect the festival adversely. When Chhatrapati Sambhaji came to know all this, on 2nd November, 1685, he wrote to Rango Vishwanath, the Deshadhikari Prant Karad, Kavi Kalash Chhandogamatya, and Ambaji Moredev, the Deshadhikari Prant Satara, and asked them to stop the evil activity of those officials.[92]

---

91. Sambhaji Kalin Patrasar Samgraha, No.159,p.51.
92. Ibid., No.166, p.55.

Chhatrapati Sambhaji saw to it that his officers acted in a proper manner. He punished them when they practised an unjust measure.. This is apparent from his document of 12th June, 1682.[93] It is stated in it that when in 1681 Sambhaji went to Shirale from Panhala, Tulaji Desai reported to him that the twelve villages of his Mirasi Deshmukhi were transferred high-handedly by Somaji Bandal to his own Deshmukhi of Warna. (After investigating into that matter) Sambhaji ordered Krishnaji Bhaskar that those twelve villages should be given back to Tulaji. As Somaji Bandal had acted in an unjust manner, Sambhaji punished him and confiscated his Mirasi Deshmukhi of Warana.

In June, 1682, it was again reported by Tulaji Desai to Sambhaji that Tulaji Kadu, who was sent by Khanderao Pansambal, for carrying out the work of those twelve villages, had started dispute about those villages with him. Tulaji Nikam then requested Chhatrapati Sambhaji to help him in solving that dispute.

Chhatrapati Sambhaji then wrote to Bapuji Trimbak, the Deshadhikari and Lekhak Prant Malkapur that those twelve villages should be given to Tulaji Nikam without any delay.

The matters stated above show that Chhatrapati Sambhaji and his ministers were taking prompt steps to put down the

---

93. SCS Khanda VI, No.111, Pp.75-76.

evil activity of their officials.

Steps to Investigate Thefts

Sambhaji's administration seems to have been prompt in conducting investigation in the matters related to theft. This is apparent from the fact that when Appaji Setiya of Kasari reported to Kavi Kalash that in the house of Somaji Nayak Desai of Tape Mahamadabad there exist stolen goods, Kavi Kalash sent Bal Joshi and Yesaji to make a search of that house. As the stolen goods were not found in that search, Kavi Kalash wrote a letter on 3rd July, 1683, to Somaji Nayak to that effect.[94]

Continuation of the Old Lands, Rights and Vatans or Inams

Since the time of Shahaji (grand father of Chhatrapati Sambhaji) Murari Khanderao Bhagat of Jejuri was enjoying a land and different rights. When that was pointed out by Mairal Gosavi, the son of Murari Khanderao Bhagat to the administration of Sambhaji, it allowed the continuance of that land and rights to Mairal Gosavi.[95]

Sambhaji continued the inam land to Gadadhar Pralhad (who later became the Pratinidhi of Chhatrapati Shahu 1708-1749), which was enjoyed by his ancestors during the time of Nizamshah, Malik Amber, Shahaji, and Shivaji.[96]

Chhatrapati Shivaji had given a Patilki Vatan of Khambgaon

---

94. Sardesai-Kaushik Gotri Mavalankar Gharanyacha Itihas, No.7, Pp.14-15.
95. Sambhaji Kalin Patrasar Samgraha, No.200, p.67.
96. Peshwa Daftar XLIV, No.40, p.82.

to Bakaji Farjand. After Shivaji, Bakaji served Sambhaji faithfully. Therefore, Sambhaji granted the hereditary vatan of Khambgaon to Bakaji.[97]

Grant of New Vatans

As has been pointed out, Chhatrapati Sambhaji had granted the DeshKulkarni Vatan of Sangameshwar to his minister, Annaji Datto, as that vatan was vacant (had no owner). After the death of Annaji, it was continued to his son Raghunath, by Sambhaji.[98]

Sambhaji had also granted the Deshkulkarni Vatan on similar grounds to Rahuji Somnath, his trusted officer.[99]

Reward for Good Work

For his residence, Chhatrapati Sambhaji had ordered Girjoji Yadav to construct a palace at Pachad. As Sambhaji was very much pleased with the construction work of that palace, he gave a reward of two thousand Hons to Girjoji Yadav.[100]

Similarly, Chhandogamatya Kavi Kalash also gave a reward of twelve hundred Hons to Girjoji Yadav when he carried out the digging and construction of a well at Pachad (probably in his mansion) according to his orders.[101]

---

97. SCS Khanda II, No.283, Pp.281-282.
98. Bendre-Maharashtretihasachi Sadhane II, No.302,Pp.321-324; Potdar,D.V.-Annaji Dattochi Vamshaval,(Shivaji Nibandhavali II, p.153).
99. Bendre-Ibid.,Sardesai-Sambhaji, Pp.35-36;p.36,F.N.
100. TKK - I, No.139,p.180.
101. Ibid.

Work of Cultural and Religious Activity

Chhatrapati Sambhaji, his ministers and officers took interest in supporting the cultural and religious activity in the Svarajya during 1680-1689. They also honoured and encouraged learning in the Svarajya by granting lands, grains, and money to the scholars. The extant documents give the following information regarding those matters.

Chhatrapati Sambhaji and Saint Ramdas

Like Chhatrapati Shivaji, Sambhaji also held in high esteem Saint Ramdas, who had, by giving a new direction to the thoughts of the people of Maharashtra, had taught them to live a meaningful life of virtue and action. The agencies which Saint Ramdas had used to achieve that aim were the temples of gods which he had established and the fairs and festivals which he had started at different places in Maharashtra.[102] As a result, a new cultural activity, which made the people to live an honourable life of self-respect and independence had taken a shape in the Svarajya. Therefore, like Chhatrapati Shivaji, Sambhaji also took interest in developing it by his support in the following manner.

On 18th October, 1680, Chhatrapati Sambhaji issued an order to his Deshadhikari of Prant Malkapur, and asked him to continue the inam lands, which were given by Shivaji

---

102. Joshi, Laxman Shastri,-Introduction, (Shri Dasabodh, Pp.8-13).

for the worship of Lord Hanuman at Chaphal to Saint Ramdas.[103] On the same date he also ordered his Deshadhikari of Prant Javali to continue the supply of money and grains which was granted by Shivaji for the worship of Lord Rama[104] and for treating the visiting saints, scholars, and pilgrims at Chaphal.[105]

As Saint Ramdas used to worship Lord Rama, the birthday festival of Lord Rama (Ramanavami) was celebrated with much enthusiasm at Chaphal every year. That festival used to draw people from all the parts of the Svarajya to Chaphal. Therefore, in order to help the establishment of Saint Ramdas in celebrating that festival in grandeur, Chhatrapati Shivaji had allotted an yearly supply of food grains, cloth, oil, etc. to that establishment. Chhatrapati Sambhaji asked the Deshadhikari of Prant Karad to continue the supply of that material.[106] Similarly, Sambhaji ordered the Deshadhikari of Prant Satara to give 11 Bighes of fertile land in each of the eleven villages granted as inam to Raghunath Dev Swami, who was in-charge of the establishment of Saint Ramdas at Chaphal[107] (in order to meet the expenses of that establishment). He also asked that officer to exempt from Vethabigari, the residents of the village Shiganawadi,

---

103. Sambhaji Kalin Patrasar Samgraha, No.12,p.4.
104. Ibid., No.10, p.3.
105. Ibid., No.11, Pp.3-4.
106. Ibid., No.13, p.4.
107. Ibid., No.16, Pp.5-6.

where a Math of Saint Ramdas having an inam existed, and where the residents were required to undertake the work of repairing that Math.[108]

Chhatrapati Sambhaji was paying much attention to hold successfully the yearly holy festival and fair at Chaphal. When he came to know that some of his troops, officials, and some of his Hindu and Muslim subjects, at times, quarrel with the people who attend that fair and put them to harassment, he wrote to Vasudev Balkrishna and ordered him to go to that fair along with the officials of Nane Ghol and other places and take steps to put an end to their mischievous activity and thereby make that fair a success.[109]

Chhatrapati Sambhaji was also interested in securing the well-being of the persons who looked after the establishment of Saint Ramdas at Sajjangad. Therefore, he ordered the Deshadhikari of Prant Satara to supply grains, wood, charcoal, grass, etc. to that establishment as was sanctioned by him.[110]

Saint Ramdas expired on 22nd January, 1682.[111] It is held traditionally that he had written a letter to Sambhaji and had asked him to rule over the Svarajya in a fair and judicious manner like Chhatrapati Shivaji.[112]

---

108. Ibid., No.17, p.6.
109. Ibid., No.15, p.5.
110. Ibid., No.20, p.7.
111. Sambhaji Shakavali, p.110.
112. Apte, D.V.,(Ed.)-Maharashtra Itihas Manjiri, Pp.112-113.

When Sambhaji learnt the news of the death of Saint Ramdas, he sent his minister, Ramachandrapant, to Sajjangad. Ramachandrapant spent much money (on behalf of Sambhaji) in charity when the funeral rites of Saint Ramdas were carried out by Uddhav Swami, a favourite disciple of that great Saint. Ramchandrapant also constructed a shrine at the place where Saint Ramdas was cremated. After that, Sambhaji visited that place and asked Ramchandrapant to construct a bigger shrine in place of the earlier small one. Ramchandrapant then constructed a bigger shrine and deciding to hold a festival of the anniversary of the death of Saint Ramdas from Magh Vadya Pratipada to Magh Vadya Navami every year, sanctioned money for that purpose.[113]

Earlier to his death, Saint Ramdas had expressed a wish that his disciple, Diwakar, should look after the matters pertaining to the establishment of Lord Rama, which was at Chaphal; a temple of Lord Hanuman should be constructed at Sajjangad; and Bhavji and Ramaji Gosavi should continue to stay at Sajjangad along with his (Ramadasa's) followers. Therefore, Chhatrapati Sambhaji wrote orders to the persons who were at Sajjangad and the Mathas of Ramdas and asked them to carry out the wishes of that great Saint. As was wished by Saint Ramdas, Sambhaji constructed a temple of Lord Hanuman at Sajjangad.[114]

---

113. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.443.
114. Ibid.

He also ordered Koner Ranganath, the Deshadhikari of Prant Satara on 13th March, 1682, to conduct the festivals and fairs of that god by spending money from the revenue of that Mahal.[115]

After the death of Saint Ramdas, there developed quarrels between his disciples for power and money even though he had appointed Diwakar Gosavi as in-charge of all his establishments. As Sambhaji sincerely felt that the arrangement wished by Saint Ramdas should be followed by his disciples, he wrote letters to them at different times and asked them to act according to the last wishes of that great Saint.[116] He then ordered his officials to keep themselves away from those quarrels.[117] Sambhaji also took the care of seeing that the income of the inam lands which were granted by his government to the establishments of Saint Ramdas went to Diwakar Gosavi. This is apparent from his letter addressed to Rango Vishwanath, the Deshadhikari of Prant Karad; Kavi Kalash Chhandogamatya, and Ambaji Moredev, the Deshadhikari of Prant Satara.[118] That letter was written by Sambhaji when he came to know that the income of the inam land, which he had granted to the temple of Lord Hanuman at Shahapur was not being received by Diwakar Gosavi as that was usurped by the Patil of that

---

115. Sambhaji Kalin Patrasar Samgraha, No.66,p.19.
116. Ibid., No.71, p.20; No.65, p.19; No.120,Pp.120-121.
117. Ibid., No.71, p.20.
118. Ibid., No.166,p.155.

village and the Pujari (officiating Brahman who worships the idol) of that temple. Sambhaji, therefore, asked his officers to reprimand that Patil severely and securing the income he had usurped from that land, hand it over to Diwakar Gosavi.

Sambhaji's Support to Other Saints and Cultural and Religious Establishments

Chhatrapati Sambhaji granted an Agrahara (A village or a Part of it given to Brahmanas held either rent-free under special grants or at a reduced rate of assignment. Sarva Agrahara is free from all taxes) to Malhar Gosavi Sadavrati Gosavi of Nadoli, even though it was earlier discontinued for some time by Shivaji on the grounds that a land of that type is not given in the Svarajya. Sambhaji then asked Bhanji Gopal, the Deshadhikari of Karad, not to take any taxes from that village.[119]

Sambhaji also gave an arable land to Vasudev Gosavi of the Kanheri Math;[120] and continued the old land grants of Moreshwar Gosavi of Morgaon[121] and Shri. Dev Swami of Chinchwad.[122]

Chhatrapati Sambhaji had given monetary help to different cultural and religious establishments in order to develop cultural activities in the Svarajya. The extant

---

119. Sanads and Letters, No.22, Pp.135-136.
120. Sambhaji Kalin Patrasar Samgraha, No.18, p.6.
121. SCS Khanda III, No.558, Pp.167-168.
122. Sambhaji Kalin Patrasar Samgraha, No.88, p.25.

documents show that he had increased the yearly amount of the Math of Patgaon from 500 to 700 Hons in order to make that Math able to undertake festivals and works of charity.[123] He also sanctioned money for a palanquin, musical instruments and palanquin bearers of that Math.[124]

Sambhaji had continued the yearly grant of money , grains and clothes to Mahadoba Gosavi (the son of the famous Saint Tukaram) of Dehu.[125]

By his Danapatra of 23rd September, 1680, Chhatrapati Sambhaji granted an yearly donation of twenty thousand Hons, well decorated elephant and five horses with ornaments to goddess Bhavani, his family deity of Tuljapur.[126]

Chhatrapati Shivaji had given an yearly grant of money to Shri. Sadananda Math of Nimb in order to make it able to supply food to Brahmanas and pilgrims. Sambhaji continued that yearly grant, and when he learnt that the officials of that Math were not doing that work properly, he wrote about it to Yesaji Malhar, the Deshadhikari of Prant Wai, and asked him to get that work properly done.[127]

Chhatrapati Sambhaji was a tolerant ruler. Therefore, he sanctioned an yearly grant of one hundred Hons to meet the expenses of frankincense, lamp, sweeper and offerings for the Sayyad Abdullakhan Pir of fort Fonda.[128]

---

123. Ibid., No.202, p.67.
124. Rajwade Khanda XX, No.281, Pp.409-410.
125. Sardesai-Peshwa Daftar XXXI, No.42, Pp.37-38.
126. Sambhaji Kalin Patrasar Samgraha, No.8, p.3.
127. Rajwade Khanda XV, No.149, Pp.181-182.
128. SCS Khanda VIII, No.46, p.51.

Sambhaji had great concern for the well-being of the saints. Therefore, he asked his army officers to effect the movements of their troops in such a manner that they will not disturb the men, animals, and fields of Moreshwar Gosavi of Shri Moreshwar and his family.[129]

Rewards to Scholars

Keshav Pandit, the Danadhyaksha of Chhatrapati Sambhaji who was an erudite scholar and author of the Danda Niti Prakaranam, a work on jurisprudence, was given inam lands and 1600 Laris as a reward by Sambhaji as Sambhaji had heard the recital of the Ramayana from him.[130]

Chhatrapati Sambhaji's minister, Moreshwar Panditrao, whose duty was to honour and reward the scholars in the Svarajya, sanctioned the yearly supply of grains to Shivabhat Nilakanthabhat Agnihotri of Karad;[131] Rudrabhat Nilakanthabhat Agnihotri of Karad;[132] Shrinivas Appa Joshi Karkare of Khanapur;[133] Anantbhat Mahadevbhat of Kandalgaon;[134] and Narasibhat Sheshbhat Munjemani.[135]

Conversion to Hinduism

Gangadhar Rangnath Kulkarni of Harsul, who was a Brahman, was in the service of the Mughals. The Mughals forcibly converted him to Islam and kept him in custody

---

129. SCS Khanda III, No.559, p.168.
130. Sanads and Letters, No.44, Pp.157-159.
131. SCS Khanda II, No.241, p.242.
132. Ibid., No.242, p.242.
133. Sambhaji Kalin Patrasar Samgraha, No.43,p.13.
134. Rajwade Khanda XX, No.271, p.388.
135. Sambhaji Kalin Patrasar Samgraha, No.180, p.59.

for three months. After that he served as a Mansabdar under Aurangzeb for a period of five years. Though he was enjoying material welfare, he was sad at heart (as he was required to give up his own religion and was made to follow Islam). Therefore, in order to get converted to Hinduism, he left the Mughal service and came to Raigad. For a period of one year he was requesting the ministers of Sambhaji and other Brahmanas to convert him to Hinduism. When Chhandogamatya Kavi Kalash came to know about it, he took pity on Gangadhar and told about him to Chhatrapati Sambhaji. Thinking about the plight to which Gangadhar was put to, Chhatrapati Sambhaji agreed to his conversion to Hinduism. After that an assembly of the Deshmukhs, Deshpandes, learned Brahmanas of Kasbe Harsul, Prant Aurangabad, and the learned Brahmanas of Maharashtra and the ministers of Sambhaji including Chhandogamatya Kavi Kalash was held and on the basis of Mitakshara and other works, that assembly converted Gangadhar Rangnath Kulkarni to Hinduism after he went through the prescribed penances.[136] Thus Sambhaji continued the liberal policy of Chhatrapati Shivaji of converting to Hinduism the Hindus who were forcibly converted to Islam.

---

136. Bendre-Maharashtretihasachi Sadhane II, No.169, Pp.199-200.

Establishment of Temples by the Officers of Sambhaji

The Mughal army devastated the territory of Torgal and Navalgund of the Dharwad district in 1684. As it had also destroyed Hindu temples in that area, Lakhava Lingappa Desai of Mamle Torgal requested the Officer of Kasba Navalgund to construct temples. Therefore, that Officer gave an inam to Venkatibhat Kashinathbhat Varanashikar and arranged for the construction of a temple at Navalgund.[137]

Role of Maharani Yesubai in the Administration of Chhatrapati Sambhaji

Maharani Yesubai seems to have taken part in the administration of Chhatrapati Sambhaji, who was constantly busy in the work of warfare against the Mughals during 1680-1689. It is felt by the scholars[138] that she must have given wiser counsel to Sambhaji from time to time. It was probably due to it that Sambhaji appointed Khando Ballal in the post of the Chitnis, even though in 1681 he had sentenced to death Khando Ballal's father, Balaji Avaji Chitnis.

Maharani Yesubai also seems to have conducted correspondence at times. This is apparent from the letter which she had written to the establishment of Saint Ramdas at Chaphal.[139] In that letter she promised that the

---

137. Sanads and Letters, No.5, p.163.
138. Sardesai-Sambhaji, p.103.
139. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.447.

persons of the army will not create any disturbance in the fair of Chaphal.

She used to put her seal " Sri Sakhi Radni Jayati " on her letters.[140]

Work of the Judicial Administration

The extant documents give the following information about the work of the judicial administration of Chhatrapati Sambhaji (1680-1689).

The department of justice of Sambhaji gave justice to the people in the (A) the Central or the Highest Court, and (B) the Local Courts at different levels.

The following were the powers and the functions of those courts.

A - The Central Court

(1) The King - As Chhatrapati Sambhaji was a coronated Hindu sovereign, he was the judicial head of the Svarajya for the temporal and ecclesiastical matters. Therefore, to perform those duties, he had included in his council two special ministers (i) the Nyayadhish (Chief Justice), and (ii) the Panditrao (Minister for Religion).

According to the ancient Hindu traditions, Chhatrapati Sambhaji used to try suits with the help of his ministers (the Rajmudra) and others in an open court known as the Dharmasabha (Judicial Assembly) or Huzur Hazir Majlis, and did not hear those alone.

---

140. Joshi-Rajyakarabharacha Itihas, p.231.

He continued the local system of trial by Majlis (Gotas) in the suits which were referred to him.

The Nyayadhish and the Panditrao - They were next to the King in the judicial administration of Sambhaji. They were appointed by Sambhaji and were responsible to him.

The Nyayadhish was having jurisdiction over all suits in the Svarajya and was to try them according to the principles laid down by the Dharma (Law).[141]

The Panditrao (Minister for Religion) was having jurisdiction over all religious matters. He was to investigate the truth, by judging what was right and what was wrong.

(2) The Huzur Hazir Majlis or Dharmasabha - Along with the Chhatrapati and his Nyayadhish, the Huzur Hazir Majlis or Dharmasabha (central judicial assembly) played an important part in the administration of justice of Chhatrapati Sambhaji.

Chhatrapati Sambhaji used to decide important suits with the help of the Dharmasabha (Huzur Hazir Majlis).

The Dharmasabha was having in it the members of the Rajmandal, State Officers (Rajmudra), and the Gota. The Rajmudra was the permanent constituent of the Dharmasabha. Its other members varied according to the nature of the case in dispute. It had jurisdiction over the disputes of

---

141. Gune-~~Judial~~ Judicial System of the Marathas, p.32.

hereditary titles (Vatans), and all matters of public importance of secular and religious nature.[142]

B - The Local Courts

Chhatrapati Shivaji had the system of trial by Majlis for the local administration of justice, and his government officers "from the heads of the three divisions and the Sarsubhas down to the Havaldars of Tarf acted only as intermediaries between the litigants and the Gota".[143]

(1) The Governors of the divisions and the Sarsubhedars - The ministers, who were the governors of the main divisions of the Svarajya of Sambhaji were the highest judicial authorities in the areas under their charge. They had original as well as appellate powers in the judicial matters of their areas.

They were assisted by the Sarsubhedars in their judicial work.

(2) The Subha or Paragana Majlis of the Diwan and the Gota -

(i) The Diwan or Raj Mudra - It had different officers who formed the Diwan or Subha. Amongst them (a) the Subhedar, and (b) the Sabhasad were important from judicial point of view.

(a) The Subhedar - He had jurisdiction over original and appellate suits. He was required to watch the proceedings of the Subha Majlis, and carry out the orders of the

---

142. Ibid., p.35.
143. Ibid.

Sarsubha if the cases were referred to him.[144]

(b) The Sabhasad - The office of the Sabhasad was conferred by the Chhatrapati on experienced persons. Probably, the Sabhasad was the chief law-authority on behalf of the government in a Majlis held to try suits.

(ii) The Subha Gota - "Along with the Diwan, the Gota or indigenous establishment of the Paragana constituted of the Vatandars or the Deshaks (native officers) and the Mirasdars (free land owners) played an important part in the Paragana administration."[145]

(3) The Thana or Tarf Majlis - The Diwan Thana and the Local Gota of the Thana formed the Thana Majlis. It was the primary judicial authority.

The Diwan Thana was the officer in charge of the Thana or the Tarf. He was called as the Thanedar or Havaldar. There existed a Karkun to assist him in his work.

In the Gota of the Tarf or Thana existed usually the Mokadam, the Kulkarni, the Deshmukh, the Deshpande, and other Mirasdars.

(4) The Village Majlis - It had the Mokadam and other members of the village in it. It had jurisdiction over the matters pertaining to the village.

The following cases which were settled by the judicial administration of Sambhaji give an idea about its working during 1680-1689.

---

144. SCS Khanda I, No.49, Pp.69-72.
145. Gune-~~Administrative~~ Judicial System of the Marathas, p.17; 36.

(1) The Hazir Majlis of Kasba Harnas of Tarf Velavand Khore resolved on 3rd December, 1680, the dispute which had taken place between Apaji Malji Naik Nigde and Vithoji Gorakhaji about the enjoyment of the rights related to their vritti.[146] It was pointed out to the members of the Hazir Majlis by Apaji Malji Naik that his family was senior to the family of Vithoji Gorakhaji and was given the rights of that Vritti. But when he had gone to Jinji for a period of 4 or 5 years, Vithoji Gorakhaji effected the partition of their estate, and taking advantage of his absence, usurped and exercised his rights of that Vritti.

The Hazir Majlis then saw the earlier documents of that Vritti and gave its verdict in favour of Apaji Malji Naik.

(2) Though Manakoji Navji Patil Chinchavade of Chinchavad was doing legitimately the work of his hereditary Mokadami of Chinchvad, his rights to that Mokadami were challenged by Keroji Sahasi Chinchavade. Therefore, Manakoji saw Chhatrapati Sambhaji and reported to him about the dispute of his Mokadami.[147] After that he also saw Peshwa Nilakantha Moreshwar and Ramachandra Nilakantha Sachiv and explained to them that even though since the time of his great-grand father the work of that Mokadami was done by the members of his family, Keroji had unwarrantedly picked

---

146. Rajwade Khanda XX, No.54, Pp.88-94.
147. Gokhale-Sambhaji, p.10.

up a quarrel about it with him. The Peshwa and the Sachiv then asked the Gota of that area to resolve that issue.

Accordingly the Gota met at Chinchvad and taking into account the evidence of both the parties, gave its verdict in favour of Manakoji.[148]

(3) A dispute about the Patilki of Abepuri in the Paragana of Wai had taken place in 1682 between Suryaji and Krishnaji Mandare and Durgoji and other Mandare Varholikar. That case was decided by the Hazir Majlis of Wai. In that case the verdict was given in favour of Durgoji.[149]

(4) Sitoji and Satvoji Bhosle had looted the agricultural fields of Mahadaji Jagdale of Umbraj and of Santaji Ghadge of Sivade and Varade. Satvoji Bhosle had also taken away high-handedly the goods and the valuables from the house of Mahadaji Jagdale.

Sitoji Bhosle had looted the agricultural fields of Santaji Ghadge.

When a complaint was made about that high-handed activity of Satvoji by Mahadaji Jagdale to Kavi Kalash and other ministers of Sambhaji at Raigad, they asked about those matters to Satvoji Bhosle. When Satvoji Bhosle denied the charges made by Mahadaji against him, they wrote to the different officers on 31st January, 1685, and asked them to submit the information about the high-handed activity

---

148. Gune-Judicial System of the Marathas, No.4,Pp.270-273.
149. Ibid., No.99, p.203.

conducted by Satvoji Bhosle.[150]

After that Mahadaji reported those matters to Chhatrapati Sambhaji. Sambhaji then called Satvoji Bhosle and inquired about the charges against him. Then on 4th February, 1685, in the Hazir Majlis of Raigad, in which Chhatrapati Sambhaji, Hambirrao Mohite and others were present, it was decided that Satvoji Bhosle was guilty of high-handedness against Mahadaji Jagdale. That matter seems to have been closed by that Majlis when Satvoji agreed to return all the goods and the valuables he had taken away from Mahadaji, and when he gave an assurance that in future he will not pick up any quarrel with Mahadaji.[151]

The details of this case reveal the fact that even when Chhatrapati Sambhaji was much busy in the war against the Mughals in 1685, he paid personal attention to the judicial matters of the Svarajya.

(5) When there had taken place a dispute about half of the rights of the Patilki Vatan of Shirode between Manakoji Rahuji Jagdale Patil of Shirode and Shivaji and Narsoji Naikda Kunbi (Peasants) of the same place; Mahadaji, the brother of Manakoji, saw Chhatrapati Sambhaji. He told Sambhaji that the Patilki Vatan of the Jagdale family is old (held by the family legitimately for several years) and

---

150. Rajwade Khanda XV, No.11, Pp.40-46.
151. Sambhaji Kalin Patrasar Samgraha, No.137,p.43.

about it an unnecessary quarrel has been started by Shivaji and Narsoji Naikda Kunbi. He then requested Sambhaji to give his verdict about that Vatan of Patilki.

Chhatrapati Sambhaji then ordered Koner Rangnath, the Mukhya Deshadhikari of Karad, to settle that matter, and sent Manakoji Jagdale to him. He also asked Koner Rangnath to call Shivaji Naikda to him and to obtain the statement of the Deshmukh, Deshkulkarni, and others, about the rights and other matters of that Patilki Vatan, and to send to him (Sambhaji) that statement after obtaining their signatures.

Accordingly, Koner Rangnath collected the Patil, Khot, Kulkarni, Bara Balutes, and other important persons of that area and asked them about the rights of that Patilki Vatan. Their statement to the effect that the claims of Manakoji Jagdale to that Patilki Vatan were legitimate and that Shivaji and Narsoji Naikda have no rights to it was sent by Koner Rangnath to Sambhaji. On the basis of that Chhatrapati Sambhaji upheld the claims of Manakoji Jagdale to the Patilki of Shirode.[152]

(6) In 1682, Vithoji Babaji, Gondoba Narayan, Balaji Rahuji, Malharji, Sajanani Timaji, Shamaji Tanhaji, and others who had shares and rights to a Wadi (an enclosed piece of meadow field) which they held at Tape Ashtami in Kasba

---

152. Rajwade Khanda XV, No.12, Pp.46-50.

Cheul, sold that Wadi willingly to Suryaji Visaji Prabhu of Tape Ashtami. At that time, Jivaji Prabhu, Nilaji Prabhu, and Gojova Prabhu, the sons of Sajanani were minors. Out of them, when Jivaji Prabhu attained the age of majority, he complained to Pralhad Niraji Nyayadhish that Suryaji Visaji Prabhu had obtained forcibly the Wadi from his relatives in 1682. Therefore, Pralhad Niraji asked about that matter to Suryaji Visaji, who had gone to Raigad at that time for some work, and found in the document of that Wadi that it was sold willingly by the relatives of Jivaji Prabhu to Suryaji . Therefore, Pralhad Niraji asked Jivaji to inquire properly about that matter with his relatives. Jivaji then went to Vithoji, Gondoba and Balaji, and [redacted] obtained from them the statements to the effect that they had sold their Wadi under force to Suryaji. After that Jivaji went to Pralhad Niraji with those statements.

As at that time confusion prevailed in the territory of Cheul due to the attacks of the Mughals, the case about that Wadi remained unsettled. When the conditions became normal, Suryaji saw Vithoji, Gondoba, and others and asked them to take back that Wadi from him after paying him the amount for the building which he had constructed and for the improvements he had carried out in that property. But they declined to pay that amount to Suryaji and thereby declined to acquire that Wadi. Then Suryaji approached Yashwantrao

Anant, the Subhedar of Cheul and requested him to settle that case. Yashwantrao then referred that case to the Hazir Majlis of Cheul. After going through the evidence of different parties, the Hazir Majlis gave the verdict that the Wadi in question was sold willingly to Suryaji by the relatives of Jivaji Prabhu. Therefore, it gave its ownership rights to Suryaji.[153]

But as Jivaji Prabhu was not satisfied by that decision, he referred that matter again to Pralhad Niraji Nyayadhish. Pralhad Niraji then obtained statement from Jivaji, Suryaji, the relatives of Jivaji; and the Deshmukh and the Officers of Prant Cheul to settle that case. It was found from that evidence that the Wadi in question was held as a Vatan by the relatives of Jivaji and therefore its sale was not permissible. It also got proved that Suryaji had acquired that Wadi from the relatives of Jivaji by practising methods of pressure. Since according to the usages of the Vatans in the Svarajya a purchaser of the Vatan was to be regarded as guilty, Pralhad Niraji held Suryaji as guilty in that case. Pralhad Niraji then asked Jivaji to pay a reasonable amount which will be decided by the Vatandars and other leading people of that area to Suryaji and take back his Vatan property from him. He also arrested the persons who had given a false

---

153. SCS Khanda IX, No.66, Pp.67-70.

evidence in the Hazir Majlis of Cheul to the effect that the Wadi in question was sold willingly to Suryaji by the relatives of Jivaji when that Majlis had taken a decision about its case earlier.[154]

(7) Gopaji and Suryaji Vitthal Prabhu had a Vatan in Prant Kalyan, Panch Mahal Pen, Paragana Sakose. Dattaji Gambaji and Vamanaji Govind advocated their claims to that Vatan. Therefore, that matter was referred to Chhatrapati Sambhaji by Gopaji and Suryaji Vitthal in October-November, 1688. Sambhaji then asked Pralhad Niraji Nyayadhish to settle that case. After that Pralhad Niraji and Moreshwar Panditrao decided it with the help of the evidence given by different witnesses and related documents. They then upheld the rights of Gopaji and Suryaji Vitthal to that Vatan.[155]

(8) The Vatan of the Kulkarni of Paragana Wai and Kasba Khum and Bavadhan was held by the fore fathers of Gangaji Shankar Deshpande. At the time when Kamalkhan was an officer at Wai, Janoba and Jauba Thite claimed their rights to that Vatan. Therefore, the father of Gangaji Shankar, Gopal Lahidev, saw Kamalkhan, and obtained from him the documents of his rights to that Vatan. But Janoba and Jauba Thite murdered Gopal Lahidev when he was on his way to home. In that episode, the papers related to that Vatan were lost and Janoba and Jauba Thite also fled from that territory.

---

154. SCS Khanda X, No.15, Pp.23-24.
155. Gokhale-Sambhaji, Pp.414-415.

In order to put an end to the dispute of that Vatan Gangaji Shankar Kulkarni met the other members of the Thite family. Then that matter was finally decided in the meeting of the Deshmukhs, Patils, Gurav, Brahmanas, and others, of that area. In it a member of the Thite family, Ramabhat Shivabhat Thite, gave in writing that Gangadhar Shankar Deshpande'a rights to that Kulkarni Vatan were legitimate.[156]

(9) On the basis of the evidence given by Vekaji Gangadhar Helvakakar Kulkarni that the Deshkulkarni Vatan of Chiplun is vacant (has no owner or claimant), Chhatrapati Sambhaji had given that Vatan to his officer, Rahuji Somnath.[157] But when the rightful claimants of that vatan pointed out to Sambhaji their rights to that Vatan, Sambhaji restored it to them.[158]

It is clear from the above stated evidence that even when Chhatrapati Sambhaji, his ministers, and officials, were in the thick of warfare against Aurangzeb, they administered justice even-handedly in the Svarajya during 1680-1689.

Military Administration

Chhatrapati Shivaji had an army of one lakh and fifty thousand troops.[159] It can, therefore, be presumed that Sambhaji had the same number of troops under him when he

---

156. Sambhaji Kalin Patrasar Samgraha, No.272,p.90.
157. Bendre-Maharashtretihasachi Sadhane II, No.302,p.329.
158. Ibid., p.332.
159. Sabhasad-Shivaji Bakhar, p.98.

became the Chhatrapati in June, 1680.

That army was organized systematically by Shivaji in such a way that "in each infantry corps there was a Naik for every ten soldiers, one Havaldar had charge of five such parties, two Havalas made one Jumaledar, ten Jumalas made a full corps of one thousand men under a Hazari, and seven Hazaris made up a Sarnobat's charge for the infantry. In the cavalry there were two divisions, Bargirs and Shiledars, and twenty-five Bargirs or Shiledars had a Havaldar over them, five Havalas made one Jumala, ten Jumalas made a Hazari's charge, and five Hazari charges made one Pancha Hazari. The Pancha Hazari was under the Sarnobat of the cavalry. Every batch of twenty-five horses had one water-carrier and farrier. Under each of the higher Maratha officers, both in the infantry and cavalry, there was a Subnis and a Karkhanis or a Muzumdar and Jamanis. The Bargir's horses were during the monsoons cantoned in camps, where every provision was made for grass and grain supplies, and barracks were built for the men to live under shelter. The gradations of officers and men in the garrisons of the hill-forts were only copied from the regulations which were enforced by Shivaji both in his infantry and in his cavalry".[160] It seems that Chhatrapati Sambhaji had continued the same arrangement for the administration of his army and forts.

---

160. Ranade, M.G.-Rise of the Maratha Power, Pp.121-122.

Chhatrapati Shivaji had 240 forts.[161] Sambhaji had all those forts under him when he became the master of the Svarajya in June, 1680.

As Sambhaji was involved in wars against the Mughals and the Portuguese throughout his reign (1680-1689), he must have recruited more number of troops than the ones which were under Shivaji. But the information about the total number of his troops is not available in the extant documents. However, taking into account that Sambhaji was required to fight against the vast armies of Aurangzeb on all the fronts of the Svarajya, and together with that, in order to carry out devastation in the parts of the Mughal empire he was sending his large number of troops, it can be presumed that he might have an army which was at least two to three times more in number than what Chhatrapati Shivaji had. Some idea about the number of his army can be had from the number of his troops who had at different times fought on the following fronts and had attacked the Mughal territories.

(i) To attack the prosperous Mughal city of Burhanpur in 1681, Sambhaji had under him 30000 troops; (ii) his 12000 troops had fought against the Mughals at Kansa near Balaghat, (iii) his 6000 troops had gone to loot Sholapur; (iv) his 6000 infantry and 2000 cavalry troops had attacked

---

161. Sabhasad-Shivaji Bakhar, Pp.100-105.

Cheul; (v) when Sambhaji had proceeded to Fonda against the Portuguese, he had an army of 15000 soldiers with him; (vi) his 7000 to 8000 troops were roving in the Kalyan-Bhiwandi area; (vii) Hambirrao Mohite had 20000 cavalry under him when had camped near Kolhapur; (viii) his commander, Janojirao had led an army of 18000 cavalry in the territory of Bijapur; and (ix) 12000 Maratha troops were moving in the territory of Lohagad.

Following were the trusted and brave generals of Sambhaji, who fought dauntlessly against the powerful army of Aurangzeb during 1680-1689.

(i) Hambirrao Mohite - He was the Commander-in-Chief of the Maratha army during 1680-1687. Together with fighting against the Mughals in the Raigad, Kolhapur, Panhala, and Kalyan-Bhiwandi sectors, he directed the generals under him to fight on all the fronts.

(ii) Peshwa Nilakantha Moreshwar - He fought the Mughal armies in the Kalyan, Bhiwandi and Cheul areas.

(iii) Yesaji Kanka and Krishnaji Kanka - They defended the fortress of Fonda successfully against the Portuguese in June, 1685. Both of them were wounded seriously in the battle against the Portuguese. Krishna Kanka died due to those wounds and Yesaji Kanka became a crippled person. Sambhaji had shown much appreciation of their valour and personal bravery and had rewarded them suitably.

(iv) Chhandogamatya Kavi Kalash - He fought against the Mughals in the territories of Raigad and Panhala.

(v) Rupaji Bhosle - He led the Maratha troops against the Mughals in Kalyan-Bhiwandi, Raigad, and Kolhapur-Panhala areas.

(vi) Malik Beg - He was the son of Lal Beg, and was under Sambhaji upto the time he went over to Aurangzeb in 1684. He had 1000 cavalry and archers under him to fight against the Mughal armies.

(vii) Malhoji Ghorpade - He became the Commander-in-Chief of the Maratha forces after the death of Hambirrao Mohite in 1687. He died in a battle against the Mughals at Sangameshwar in February, 1689.

(viii) Hirji Mahadik - He was the Maratha Subhedar of Jinji in Karnataka. He fought wars against the Mughal armies in Karnataka, and Chikkadeva Raja of Mysore, who had entered in an alliance with Aurangzeb against Chhatrapati Sambhaji.

(ix) Dadaji Kakade - He was a gallant general under Hirji Mahadik. He fought against the Mysore army.

(x) Jaitaji Katkar - He also played an important role in the military activity of the Marathas in Karnataka under Hirji Mahadik.

Under the directions of their generals, the Maratha troops laid sieges to the enemy fortress of Danda Rajapuri, Cheul, Underi, Ahmednagar, Sholapur, etc.

Together with this they also successfully foiled the sieges of the Mughal forces laid to the Maratha forts of Fonda, Ramsej, Trimbakgad, Pattagad, Rohida, Purandar, Panhala, etc.

The troops of Chhatrapati Sambhaji also penetrated in the following areas of the Mughals in order to conduct loot and devastation: Aurangabad, Burhanpur, Nanded, Bhir, Jalna, Chanda, Parinda, Malkapur, Ahmednagar, etc.

The Maratha troops also attacked the Portuguese territories of Elephanta, Karanja, Tarapur, Aseri, Salsette, and Bardesh. In Karnataka they attacked the territories of Shrirangapattam, Madura, Banavar, Trichinapalli, and other areas.

In the attacked territories, the Maratha troops captured animals and tried to collect Chauth. It was due to their continuous raids on the Mughal territories that Aurangzeb could not become successful in effecting concentration of his armies against the Svarajya upto 1687. He was also required to deploy his troops constantly to the areas in which the Marathas had effected penetration.

Navy

Chhatrapati Shivaji had developed the Maratha navy in order to protect the Svarajya from the sea powers like the English and the Portuguese. After Shivaji, Sambhaji became the master of that navy.

The important officers of the Maratha navy under Sambhaji were, Daulatkhan, Dadaji Prabhu Deshpande, Mayanak Bhandari, Kavji Muhammad, Santaji Pawala and Siddi Mistry.

The Maratha sea forts of Khanderi, Padmadurg, Sindhudurg formed the base of the Maratha navy which guarded the ports and the sea of the Svarajya.

The extant documents do not give information about the total strength of the Maratha navy or the naval troops under Sambhaji. Following are some of the details related to those matters.

(i) At Rajapur existed 60 Galvetts and about 4000 to 5000 Maratha naval troops; (ii) at Pen were posted 3000 Maratha naval troops; (iii) Subhedar Sundarji Baji had 22 Gurabas and 3000 naval troops; (iv) in order to attack the island of Bombay, the Marathas had kept 85 Galvetts and 5000 naval troops; (v) at Thal were stationed 5000 Maratha naval troops; (vi) 4000 naval troops had gone to attack Danda Rajapuri under the Maratha general, Dadaji Naras Prabhu; (vii)Siddi Mistry and Daulatkhan, the naval commanders of the Svarajya had respectively 30 and 80 Galvetts under them; (viii)the Maratha navy had 76 war-ships in the river of Naigaum in 1683; (ix) in 1685 Sambhaji's navy had 60 war ships, 10 Palas and two newly constructed ships. Those had in them more than 300 cannons; (x) Sambhaji had maintained 15000 naval troops in the area of Nagothane, Koralai and Cheul and 1000 naval troops at Danda Rajapuri. He had 120 Galvetts and 76 ships. From this it can be presumed that Sambhaji probably had 25000 to 30000 naval troops.

All the forts of Sambhaji were having adequate war material and other things stored in them. Therefore, those could be ably defended by his troops from the constant attacks of the Mughals.

Payment to the Army and Navy

Chhatrapati Sambhaji made cash payments to all his troops. He also gave cash rewards to the soldiers in the appreciation of their bravery and sacrifice. This is proved by the fact that he gave cash rewards to Krishnaji Kank and Yesaji Kank, and honoured the commandant of fort Ramsej.

The troops of Sambhaji were disciplined ones. He had a strict supervision on their activities and he reprimanded them sternly whenever he found them wavering from discipline.[162]

The above facts prove that Chhatrapati Sambhaji was a skilled military commander and had under him a well-trained and well organized army. But as has been pointed out earlier, its members started deserting to the Mughals as Sambhaji could not pay them properly. Due to that the military strength of the Svarajya declined gradually and the Mughal armies entered deep in the Maratha territory when Sambhaji was captured by Mukarrabkhan on 1st February, 1689.

Taking into account the data stated earlier it is clear that even though Sambhaji was a good administrator and a skilled general, who gave impartial justice to the subjects, his reign ended in a tragic manner because of the diplomatic error he had committed of giving an asylum to Prince Akbar at the instance of Kavi Kalash who exerted an evil influence on Sambhaji since 1678.

---

162. Sambhaji Kalin Patrasar Samgraha, No.233, Pp.76-77.

APPENDIX - A

श्री छत्रपति संभाजी महाराजांचे दानपत्र[1]

(मूळ संस्कृत दानपत्राचा सारांश)

(१६ ओरजी पिंपळपानी शिक्का '' श्री । शंभोः शिव/जातस्यमुद्राद्यौ । रिव जायते ।। यदं । क सेविनो लेखा/वर्तति कस्य नो । परी '' सात ओळींचा ।)

* ।। मतं श्री हशवराजपुत्रस्य श्रीशंभूराज ।।

।। छत्रपते : यदैत्रोपरिलेखितं ।। छं ।। श्री ।।

जामदग्न्यगोत्री, क-हाडे, बाकरे आडनावाचे, रामक्षेत्रातील (परशुराम क्षेत्र, कोंकण) कुडाळ गावचे, नामदेव भट्टाचे पुत्र, आश्वलायन सूत्री, ऋग्वेदान्तर्गत शाकलशाखाध्यायी, श्रेष्ठ मांत्रिक महाशयस्वामी यांना शिखर शिंगणापूरच्या यात्रेला गेला असताना, शूराग्रण्य देवब्राह्मण प्रतिपालक मालोजी राजे यांचा पणतू (प्रपौत्र), रात्रियुध्द प्रवीण, निजामशाहीतील श्रेष्ठ प्रधान मलिकंबर यांचा पराभव करणारा, स्वतःचा जीव धोक्यात घालून देवालयांचे रक्षण करणारा, शूंकराचे कृपास्थान (शहाजी), मोगल इत्यादींचा काळपूरुष, हैंदवी धर्माचा जीर्णोध्दार करणारा, अशा (शहाजी) श्री शहाजी राजांचा नातू, प्रबळ अफजुलखानाला विछु (विंचवा) च्या सहाय्याने मारून त्याच्या रक्ताने न्हालेला, पंचाहत्तर हजार घोडदळाने वेढलेला - पराक्रमी राजपुत्रांनी संरक्षित अशा दिल्लीद्राचा मामा (शाहिस्तेखान) याचा पराभव करणारा, म्लेंच्छांच्या क्षयाची दीक्षा घेतलेला, विजयपुरायेश्वरादिकांना खंडणी द्यावयास लावणारा, कर्नाटक राज्य जिंकणारा, क्षत्रिय कुलावतंस महापराक्रमी अशा श्री छत्रपती

---

1. Gokhale-Sambhaji, Pp.432-434.

* ही अक्षरे श्री शंभूछत्रपतींच्या हातची आहेत.

शिवराजांचा पुत्र, अनेक देवतांच्या प्रार्थनेने जन्माला आलेले, दिल्लीपतीने केलेल्या मल्ल युध्दाच्या आज्ञेचा भंग सोडला तर आपल्या अत्यंत गोड भाषणाने दिल्लीश्वराचे चित्त ज्यांनी आकृष्ट केले, चक्रवर्तित्वाची सामुद्रिक चिन्हे धारण करणारे, सुरू झालेल्या प्रबल वैराग्य प्रविष्ट झालेल्या दुष्ट मंत्र्यांच्या ' जेष्ठ पुत्राला राज्यदान करू नये ' (या दुष्ट सल्यामुळे जिचे हृदय कलुषित झाले आहे, वस्तुतः निळ्या पिवळ्या पार्श्वभूमीत असलेल्या स्फटिकमध्या प्रमाणे जिचे हृदय स्वच्छ, सौजन्ययुक्त आहे, अशा राणी विषयी पक्षपातामुळे शिवराजाचे मत आपल्या विरूध्द असल्याचे समजून सुध्दा केवळ तेवढ्याच कारणाने पितृभक्तित अंतर पडू न देणारे, कर्तव्य पालनात दाशरथी रामाचा विक्रम गाजविणारे, पायाशी असलेली दीड कोटी संपत्ती, अनेक किल्ले आणि राजपद यांना तृणाप्रमाणे तुच्छ मानून त्याग करणारे, बरोबर थोडे घोडेस्वार घेतले होते. तथापि औरंगजेबाच्या बेडदळाच्या सेनापतीशी संगनमत करून त्याचेकडून सात हजार घोडेस्वार मिळवून त्यांच्या बळावर भूपाल किल्ला ज्यांनी सर केला, दलेलासुर (दिलेरखान) याने गुंडघा नाक्यामुळे संतप्त झालेल्या कवि कलशाच्या प्रोत्साहनाने लाल झालेल्या डोळ्यांनी इष्ट देवतेची अनुज्ञा ज्यांनी मिळविली आहे अशा शंभूराजांनी शके १६०२ रौद्रनाम संवत्सर, भाद्रपद शुध्द १० सोमवार या काली झालेल्या राज्य प्राप्तीच्या वेळी आश्वासिलेले, राज्याभिवृध्दी वगैरे फलांच्या सिध्दीसाठी गुरूपादुका पूजनपूर्वक श्री पादुकापुजनाच्या निमित्ताने केलेले, २४ गुंजा सोन्याचे एक याप्रमाणे १० हजार सुरती नाण्यांचे दान दरवर्षी स्वतः (शंभूराजे) व स्वामी (महाशय स्वामी) यांच्या पुत्र - पौत्रादिपरंपरेने अनुक्रमे चालवावे व उपभोगावे (या पूर्वीचे) स्वामींचे वर्षासन यातच अंतर्गत समजावे.

नारायणाध्वरीद्रस्य रघुनाथमिषः सुतः । आमात्यो दानपत्रेस्मिन्लेखनालंकृतिं व्यधात् । लेखनालंकार

संमत आबाजी
सोन देऊ सचीव
चंद्र ११ मास भाद्रपद
मास भाद्रपद ऊर्फ सावान
सन इहिदे समा बीन अलफ

बार सुद बार शुध बार

अनुमतंच दानाध्यक्ष मोरेश्वर पंडितरायास्य शुभमस्तु छ लक्ष्मी नृसिंहभक्त श्री नीरेरामो याज्ञियसन्मणे : ।। प्रल्हादवर्धनी मुद्रा प्रल्हादस्य विजृंभते मर्यादेयं विजयते

(वाटोळ्य शिक्का)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ORIGINAL SOURCES

A. CONTEMPORARY SOURCES

Dingal or Rajasthani Variety of Hindi

Dingal Letters of Shivaji's Visit to Aurangzib and After (Eng. Trans.) Sarkar, J., House of Shivaji, (3rd Ed., M.C. Sarkar and Sons, Ltd., Calcutta, 1955)

Rajasthani Records - Shivaji's Visit to Aurangzib at Agra (A Collection of Contemporary Rajasthani Letters from the Jaipur State Archieves) - Sarkar, J., and Raghubir Sinh, (Indian History Congress, Calcutta, 1963)

English

English Records on Shivaji (1659-1682) Vols.1-2 - (Ed.), Sen, S.N., (Shiva Charitra Karyalaya, Poona, 1931).

Fryer, John, A New Account of East India and Persia Being Nine Year's Travels - 1672-1681 - (Ed.), Crooke,W., (Kraus Reprint Ltd., Nendle In/ Liechtenstein, 1967)

Records of Fort St. George - Diary and Consultation Book of - (Pub. The Madras Record Office, Madras)

Records of Fort St. George - Letter to Fort St.George - (Pub. The Madras Record Office, Madras)

French

Abbe Carre, Sequal to the History of Sevaji - (Ed. & Trans.) Sen, S.N., Foreign Biographies of Shivaji,(Extracts and documents relating to Maratha History), Vol.II, (The Book Co. Ltd., Calcutta, 1927).

Bernier, Francois, Travels In the Mughal Empire - A.D. - - 1656-1668 - (Ed. & Trans.) Constable, A., (S.Chand & Co., Delhi, 1968).

Father J. Bertrand, La Mission Du Madura III, (Eng.Trans.), Aiyar, R. Sathyanatha, History of the Nayaks of Madura.

Martin, Francois, Memoirs, Vol. II and III, (Paris, 1932) - (Portions related to Sambhaji and Rajaram), (Eng.Trans.), Sarkar, J. House of Shivaji, (3rd Ed., Calcutta, 1955).

Kannada

Apratima Vira Charitam - Tirumalacharya, (Marathi Trans.) (Ed.), Desai, P,B., Shivacharitra - Vritta Samgraha (Khanda I, Kanadi Vibhag), (BISM, Poona, 1938).

Chikkadevarajbinnapam - Chikkadevaraj, (Marathi Trans. Ed.), Desai, P.B., Shivacharitra Vritta Samgraha (Khanda I, Kanadi Vibhag), (BISM, Poona, 1938).

Marathi

Ainapatra (Marathe Shahitil Rajniti) -(Ed.), Rao, V.D., (S.B. Bhat, Dhulia, 1955)

Ainapatra - (Eds.), Khare, G.H. and Bhide, S.R., (City Book Stall, Poona, 1960).

Ainapatra Arthat Shivaji Rajanchi Rajniti - (Ed.), Banahatti, S.N., (Suvichar Prakashan Mandal, Nagpur & Poona, 1965).

Amatyakrit Marathe Shahitil Rajniti - Ainapatra - (Ed.), Joshi, P.N., (Venus Prakashan, Poona, 1960).

Hukumat Panha Ramchandrapant Amatya Yanche Ainapatra Ani Rajniti - (Eds.), Joshi, S.N., and Bhingare, L.M., (Continental Prakashan, Poona, 1960).

Marathe Shahitil Rajniti Athava Ramchandrapant Amatya Bavadekar Likhit Ainapatra - (Pub. Moramkar, A.A., Bombay, 1923).

Marathe Shahitil Rajniti - Ainapatra - (Ed.), Garge, B.G. and Ghate, D.V.,(Veena Prakashan, Nagpur, 1945).

Jedhe Shakavali - (Eds.), Apte, D.V., and Divekar, S.M., Shiva Charitra Pradip, (BISM, Poona, 1925).

Jedhe Yancha Karina - (Eds.), Apte, D.V., and Divekar, S.M., Shiva Charitra Pradip, (BISM, Poona, 1925).

Krishnaji Anant Sabhasad, Chhatrapati Shri Shivaji Raje Yanchi Bakhar - (Ed.), Joshi, S.N., (Chitrashala Prakashan, Poona, 1960).

Saint Ramdas - Shri Samartha Ramdas Svamikrita Shri Dasabodh - (Pub. Salgaonkar, J., Dadar, 1962).

Sambhaji Kalin Patra Sar Samgraha - BISMQ XXX, Nos.1-2)

Shiva Charitra Sahitya Khanda - I-XII, (Pub. BISM, Poona)

Shiva Kalin Patra Sar Samgraha, Vols. I-III; (Pub. Shri Shiva Charitra Karyalaya, Poona, 1930).

Shiva Kalin Shakavali - (Ed.), Joshi, S.N., SPSS-III, (BISM, Poona, 1937).

Shivapur Daftaratil Yadi - (Eds.), Apte, D.V., and Divekar, S.M., Shiva Charitra Pradip, (BISM, Poona, 1925)

Shivapur Deshpande Vahitil Shakavali - (Eds.), Apte, D.V., and Divekar, S.M. Shiva Charitra Pradip, (BISM, Poona, 1925).

Mixed European Languages

Manucci, Niccolao, Storia Do Mogor, Vol. II, (Eng. Trans) Irvine, W., (Editions Indian, Calcutta, 1966).

Persian

Aitihasik Farsi Sahitya - Khanda VI - Aurangzebachya Darbarache Akhabar - (Mar. Trans. Eds.), Khare, G.H., and Kulkarni, G.T., (BISM, Poona, 1973).

Bagalanacha Daulatmandakhan Yanchi Patre - (Mar. Trans. Ed.), Pagadi, Setumadhavrao, (BIAS, XI, No.42).

Haft Anjuman - Mirza Raja Jaising Yanchi Patren - (Mar. Trans. Ed.), Pagadi Setumadhavrao, Mogal-Maratha Sangharsha (Farsi Sadhane), (Chitrashala Press Prakashan, Poona, 1964).

Futuhate Alamgiri - Ishwardas Nagar - (Mar. Trans. Ed.), Pagadi, Setumadhavarao, Mogal Maratha Sangharsha, (Chitrashala Press Prakashan, Poona, 1964)

Letters of Matabar Khan, The Mughal Governor of Kalyan - (Eng. Trans. Ed.), Pagadi, Setumadhavrao, Studies in Maratha History Vol. II, Shivaji University, Kolhapur, 1971).

Muntakhabullubbab - Muhammad Hashim Khafikhan - (Mar. Trans. Ed.), Khare, G.H., (BISMQ XX, No.4, Pp.61-68; XXI, No.1, Pp.89-91).

Muntakhabullubbab-i or Tarikhe Khafikhan - Muhammad Hashim Khafikhan - (Mar. Trans. Ed.), Pagadi, Setumadhavrao, (Joshi Ani Lokhande Prakashan, Poona, 1962).

Khutute Shivaji - (Mar. Trans.Ed.), Pagadi, Setumadhavrao, Mogal-Maratha Sangharsha (Farsi Sadhane,), Chitrashala Press Prakashan, Poona, 1964).

Massir-i-Alamgiri - Muhammad Saqi Mustaidkhan - (Mar.Trans. Ed.), Khare, G.H., (BISM XXI, No.1, Pp.91-96).

Massir-i-Alamgiri - Muhammad Saqi Mustaidkhan, (Mar, Trans. Ed.), Pagadi, Setumadhavrao, Marathe Va Aurangzeb, (Dnyanaraj Prakashan, Poona, 1963).

Mogal Darbarachi Batami Patre - (Mar. Trans. Ed.),Pagadi Setumadhavrao, (BIAS XI, No.44)

Tarikh-i-Dilkasha (Memoirs of Bhimsen relating to Aurangzib's Deccan Campaigns) - (Eng. Trans, Ed.), Khobrekar, V.G., (Department of Archives, Maharashtra, Bombay, 1972).

Tarikh-i-Dilkusha - Bhimsen Saxena - (Mar.Trans. Ed.), Pagadi, Setumadhavrao, Mogal Ani Marathe, (Thokal Prakashan, Poona, 1963).

Portuguese

Bole tim da Filmoteca Ultramarina Portuguesa-IV, (Lisbon, 1959) 527; VII, (Lisbon, 1962) 237.

Marathyanchya Itihasachi Sadhane - Portuguese Daftar - Khanda Tisara-Asia Vishag (Bhaga 1 to 5) (A.D. 1663-1739) - (Mar. Trans. Ed.), Desai, S.S., (Maharashtrarajya Sahitya Va Samsriti Mandal, Bombay, 1968).

Sanskrit

The Budhabhushana of King Shambhu - (Ed.), Velankar, H.D., (Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, 1926).

Gagabhattakritah Shri Shivarajabhisheka Proyogah - Coronation of Shivaji the Great - (Ed.), Bendre,V.S., (P.P.H. Book Stall, Bombay, 1960).

Paramanandakavya of Kavindra Paramananda - (Ed.), Sardesai, G.S., (Oriental Institution, Baroda, 1952).

Rajarama Charitam Athava Jinjicha Pravas - Keshav Pandit, (Mar. Trans. Ed.), Bendre, V.S., (BISM, Poona, 1931).

Sankarshana Sakalkalekrita Shivakaya - (Mar. Trans. Ed.), Gosvami, R.P., (BISM, Poona, 1974).

Shri Chhatrapati Sambhaji Maharajanche Danapatra (24th August, 1680) - Mar. Trans.), Gokhale, Kamal, Shivaputra Sambhaji, (Pp.432-434).

B. LATER SOURCES

Kannada

Keladiya Nripa Vijayam - Linganna Kavi, (Mar. Trans.Ed.), Desai, P.B., Shiva Charitra Vritta Samgraha (Khanda I - Kannada Vibhag, Pp.40-74).

Marathi

Bhosle and Peshwa's Bakhar - (Ed.), Chandrashekaran, T., (Madras Government Oriental Manuscripts Series, No.64, Government of Madras, Madras, 1959).

Mantri Dattaji Trimal Wakenavis Virachit Shiva Chhatrapatichi 91 Kalami Bakhar - (Ed.), Vakaskar, V.S., (Moramkar, A.A., Bombay, 1930).

Marathi Samrajyachi Chhoti Bakhar (Kavyetihasa Samgraha-29) - (Ed.), Modak, J.B., (Poona, 1889).

Pant Pratinidhichi Bakhar - (Bharat Varsha, No.2, Margashirsha, Shake 1818).

Senapati Dabhade Va Gaikwad Yanchi Hakikat - (Ed.), Sane K.N.

Shivajichi Bakhar - (Ed.) Kotasthane, M.M., (Kotasthane, M.M., Bombay, 1935)

Shri Shiva Chhatrapatinche Sapta Prakaranatmak Charitra - Malhar Ramrao Chitnis - (Ed.), Herwadkar, R.V., (Venus Prakashan, Poona, 1967).

Shri. Shivadigvijaya (Shri Shivaji Maharajanchi Bakhar - (Eds.), Nandurbarkar, P.R. and Dandekar, L.K., (Nandurbarkar, P.R. and Dandekar, L.K., Baroda, Shake 1817).

Shri Shiva Chhatrapatinchi 91 Kalami Bakhar Ani Bhosale Gharanyachi Charitavali - (Ed.), Vakaskar, V.S., (Venus Prakashan, Poona, 1962).

Shrimant Chhatrapati Sambhaji Maharaj Ani Thorale Rajaram Maharaj Yanchi Charitre - Malhar Ramrao Chitnis - (Ed.), Sane, K.N., (4th Ed., Sane, V.S., Kalyan, Shake 1851).

Thorale Rajaram Maharaj Yanche Charitra Athava Rajaram Maharajanchi Bakhar - Malhar Ramrao Chitnis - (Ed.), Juvekar, Pramodini, (Poona, 1963).

Persian

Busatinussalatin - Muhammad Ibrahim Azzubairi - (Mar. Trans. Ed.), Khare, G.H., Shiva Charitra Vritta Samgraha - Khanda II - Farsi Vibhag, (BISM, Poona,1939).

Golkondyachi Kutbshahi - (Mar. Trans. Ed.), Bendre,V.S., (BISM, Poona, 1934).

Maasirul Umara Vol.I - (Hindi Trans. Ed.), Vrajarathadas, (Nagari Pracharini Sabha, Kashi, Vikram Samvat 1988).

Vijapurchi Adilshahi - Busatin - Use - Salatin Ya Farsi Granthache Narasinharao Vitthal Parasnis Krita Marathi Bhashantar - (Ed.), Bendre, V.S.,(Mumbai Marathi Grantha Samgrahalaya, Dadar, 1968.)

C. MISCELIANEOUS SOURCES

Aitihasik Patravyavahar - (1690-1867) - (Ed.),Sardesai,G.S., Kulkarni, K.P., and Kale, Y.M., (Poona, 1933).

Aitihasik Sadhane (A.D. 1588 to 1821) -(Aitihasik Prakashan Granthamala Kramanka 2), (Ed.), Avalaskar, S.V., (Aitihasik Kagadpatra Va Puratan Smarak Sallagar Mandal, Maharashtra Shasan, Bombay, 1963).

Decisions from the Shahu and Peshwa Daftar Containing (Watan - Patras, Nivad-Patras, etc.), (Ed.), Vad, G.C., Mawjee, P.V., and Parasnis, D.B., (Mawjee, P.V., Bombay, 1909).

Karvir Sardaranchya Kaifiyati - (Ed.), Gaikwad, K.A., (Kolhapur, 1971).

Kayyetihas--Samgrahat Prasiddha Zalele Aitihasik Patre Yadi Vagaire Lekh - (Ed.), Sardesai, G.S., Kale, Y.M. and Vakaskar, V.S., (Chitrashala Press, Poona, 1930).

Maharastretihasachi Sadhane Vols. 1-2, (Ed.), Bendre, V.S., Mumbai Marathi Grantha Samgrahalaya, Dadar, 1966).

Marathyanchya Itihasachi Sadhane - Vols. II, III, VIII, XV, XX - (Ed.), Rajwade, V.K.

Pant Amatya Bavada Daftar - Vol.I (Ed.), Sabnis, K.G., (Secretary, J. Bavada, Bavada, 1937).

Peshwe Daftaratun Nivadlele Kagad - (Jamav Vibhagatil Kagad), Vol. XXXI, XLIV - (Ed.), Sardesai, G.S.

Selections from the Government Records in the Alienation Office Poona - Sanads and Letters - (Ed.), Vad, G.C., Mawjee, P.V., and Parasnis,D.B., (Mawjee, P.V., Poona,1913).

Selections From the Satara Raja's And the Peishawa's Diaries - I - Shahu Chhatrapati - (Ed.), Vad,G.C., and Parasnis, D.B., (Deccan Vernacular Translation Society, Poona).

Tarabai Kalin Kagad Patre - Vols. I-II - (Ed.), Pawar, A.G., (Shivaji Vidyapitha, Kolhapur).

D. OTHER SOURCES

Sanskrit

Kautilya's Arthashastra - (Ed.), Sharma Sastry, R., (M.S. Srinivas, Mysore, 1956).

SECONDARY WORKS

English

Aiyar, R. Sathyanath - History of the Navaks of Madura

Athar Ali, M. - The Mughal Nobility under Aurangzeb, (New York, 1966).

Banaji, R.D., - Bombay and the Siddis

Basham, A.L. - The Wonder that was India, (Fontana Books in association with Rupa & Co., Calcutta, 1967).

Burn, Richard, (Ed.) - The Cambridge History of India - Vol. IV - (The Mughal Period), (S.Chand & Co., Delhi, 1971).

Desai, P.B., - A History of Karnataka, (Karnataka University Dharwar, 1970).

Desai, W.S. - Bombay and the Marathas, (Munshiram Manoharlal, New Delhi, 1970).

Ghosh, A.B. (Ed.) - The Cultural Heritage of India - Vol.IV- The Religions, (The Ramakrishna Mission, Institute of Culture, Calcutta, 1969).

Grant Duff, J. - A History of the Mahrattas - Vol.I, (R. Cambray & Co., Calcutta, 1912).

Gune, V.T. - The Judicial System of the Marathas, (Deccan College Post-graduate and Research Institute, Poona-6, 1953).

Hatalkar, V.G. - Relations between the French and the Marathas (1668-1815), (University of Bombay, Bombay, 1958).

Kincaid, C.A. and Parasnis, D.B. - History of the Maratha People - Vol.II.

Kulkarni, A.R. - Maharashtra in the Age of Shivaji, (Deshmukh & Co., Poona, 1969).

Marshman, J.C. - Abridgment of the History of India - From Earliest Period to the Present time, (William Blackwood & Sons, London, MCM XIII).

Mujumdar, S.G. - Prabhuratna Mala

Muddachari, B. - Mysore-Maratha Relations, (Mysore,1969).

Nayeem, M.A. - External Relations of the Bijapur Kingdom (1489-1686 A.D.)--(A Study in Diplomatic History), (Bright Publishers, Hyderabad, 1974).

Pagadi, Setumadhavrao - Chhatrapati Shivaji, (Continental Prakashan, Poona, 1974).

Pagadi, Setumadhavrao - Lectures on Maratha Mughal Relations (1680-1707), (Nagpur University, Nagpur, 1966).

Ranade, M.G., - Rise of the Maratha Power, (Punalekar & Co., Bombay, 1900).

Sardesai, G.S. - New History of the Marathas - Vol.I, Shivaji and His Line (1600-1707), (Second Impression, Phoenix Publications, Bombay, 1957).

Sarkar, J. - History of Aurangzib - Vol.III, (Orient Longman Ltd., Bombay, 1972).

Sarkar, J.N. - History of Aurangzib - Vol.IV, (M.C.Sarkar & Sons, Calcutta, 1919).

Sarkar, J. - Studies in Mughal India, (M.C. Sarkar, Calcutta, 1919).

Sarkar, J. - Shivaji and His Times, (Orient Longman, Ltd., Bombay, Longman's 1st Impression, 1973).

Sarkar J.N. - Bihar and Orissa During the Fall of Mughal Empire, (Patna, 1932).

Satish Chandra - Parties and Politics at the Mughal Court, 1707-1740, (2nd Ed., People's Publishing House, New Delhi, 1972).

Sen, S.N. - Administrative System of the Marathas, (University of Calcutta, Calcutta, 1923).

Sherwani, H.K. - History of the Kutb Shahi Dynasty, (Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 1974).

Srinivasachari, C.S. - A History of Ginjee and its Rulers, (Annamalai University, Annamalainagar, 1943).

Srinivasan, C.K. - Maratha Rule in the Carnatic, (Annamalai University, Annamalainagar, 1944).

Vaidya, C.V. - Shivaji The Founder of Maratha Swaraj, (C.V. Vaidya, Poona, 1931).

Venkateswara, S.V. - Indian Culture through the Ages-Vol.II - Public Life and Political Institutions.

Hindi

Reu, Pandit Vishveshvarnath - Marwad Ka Itihas - Vol. I, (Jodhpur Archaeological Department, Jodhpur, 1938).

Sarkar, J. - Shivaji (Maharashtra - Jativa Jivan - Surya), (3rd Ed., Hindi Grantha Ratnakar (Pvt.), Bombay, 1959).

Marathi

Apte, D.V. - Maharashtra Itihas Manjiri, (2nd Ed., Chitra-shala Press, Poona, 1948).

Athavale, S. - Shivaji Ani Shivayug, (Ajab Pustakalaya, Kolhapur, 1971).

Bendre, V.S. - Shri Chhatrapati Shivaji Maharaj Yanche Vichikitskaka Charitra - Purvardha Va Uttarardha, (Bendre, V.S., Bombay, 1972).

Bendre V.S. - Chhatrapati Sambhaji Maharaj, (Bendre, V.S., Poona, 1960).

Bendre, V.S. - Chhatrapati Sambhaji Maharaj,(2nd Ed., Bombay)

Bendre, V.S. - Rana Jaisingh Ani Shivaji Maharaj, (Itihas Samshodhan Mandal, Dadar, 1965).

Bendre, V.S. - Sadhana Chikitsa, (Bendre, V.S., Poona, 1928).

Bhosle, B.K. - Janjira Samsthancha Itihas, (Bhosle,B.K., Murud-Janjira, 1898).

Chauhan, D.V. - Dakhini Hinditil Itihas Va Itar Lekh, (Itihas Samshodhan Mandal, Dadar, 1973).

Gokhale, Kamal - Shivaputra Sambhaji, (Dnana-Vidnyana Vikas Mandal, Poona, 1971).

Herwadkar, R.V. - Marathi Bakhar, (Poona, 1957).

Joshi, S.N. - Arvachin Maharastretihaskalatil Rajvakarbharch Abhyasa - Part I - A.D. 1600 to 1680, (Pune Vidyapith Prakashan, Poona, 1959).

Khare, G.H.- Shiva Charitra Samshodhan Vritta - Rajyabhishek Shaka 279, (Khare, G.H., Poona, 1953).

Pagadi, Setumadhavrao - Hindavi Svarajya Ani Mogal, (Venus Prakashan, Poona, 1966).

Pissurlenkar, P.S. - Portugej-Marathe Sambandha Arthat Portugejanchya Daftaratil Marathyancha Itihas, (University of Poona, Poona, 1967).

Sardesai, G.S. - Shakakarta Shivaji, (Dhawale, K.B., Bombay, 1935).

Sardesai, G.S. - Ugraprakriti Sambhaji, (Dhawale,K.B. Bombay, 1935).

Sardesai, V.N. - Kaushik GotriMavalankar Gharanyacha Itihas Arthat Mavalankar, Sardesai, Lalit Va Govilkar Shakhancha KulaVrittanta, (Sardesai, S.R., Poona, 1961).

Shejvalkar, T.S. - Shri Shiva Chhatrapati (Sankalpit Shivacharitrachi Prastavana, Arakhada, (Maratha Mandir Prakashan, Bombay, 1964).

MISCELLANEOUS WORKS

English

De Souza, J.P. and Kulkarni, C.M., (Eds.) - Historiography In Indian Languages, (Dr. G.M. Moraes Felicitation Volume), (Oriental Publishers, Delhi, 1972).

Proceedings of the All India Modern History Congress - First Session - Poona - June, 1935, (Poona, October, 1938).

Proceedings of the Indian Historical Records Commission.

Vijayanagar Sexcentenary Commemoration Volume, (Pub. Vijayanagar Empire Sexcentenary Association, Dharwad, 1936).

Marathi

Apte, D.V. and Divekar, S.M., (Eds.) - Shiva Charitra Pradip, (Divekar, S.M., Poona, 1925).

Chitrav, Siddheshvar Shastri, (Ed.) - Bharatvarshiya Madhyayugin Charitra Kosh (Maurya Chandraguptapasun Peshwai Akher B.C. 321 - A.D. 1818), (Bharatvarshiya Charitra Kosh Mandal, Ltd., Poona, 1937).

Sardesai, G.S. - Historical Geneologies, (State Board for Historical Records and Ancient Monuments, Bombay, Bombay, 1957).

Sardesai, G.S., (Ed.) - Shivaji Souvenir, (Dhawale,K.B., Bombay, 1927).

Shivaji Nibandhavali, Vols. 1-2 - (Pub. Shri Shiva Charitra Karyalaya, Poona, 1930).

Mehendale, K.C., and Potdar, D.V., (Ed.) - Tritiya Sammelan Vritta - Shake 183 , (BISM, Poona, Shake 1838).

Varshik Iti Vritta - Shake 1835 - (BISM, Poona).

JOURNALS

Bharatvarsha

Bharat Itihas Samshodhan Mandal Quarterly, Poona.

Bharatiya Itihas Ani Samkriti - Dadar.

Itihas Ani Aitihasik

Navabharat (Monthly, Wai).

Quarterly Review of Historical Studies, Calcutta.

Ramdas Ani Ramadasi, Dhulia.

Shri Saraswati Mandir